

Theodore of Mopsuestia,
*On the Incarnation of the Lord against
 the Apollinarians and Eunomians* (Fragments)

*Introduction and Translation of Greek
 and Latin Fragments by Mark DelCogliano*

Translation of Syriac Fragments by Ellen Muehlberger

Arrangement of Fragments and Appendix by Mark DelCogliano

INTRODUCTION

Theodore was a native of Antioch, where he was trained in rhetoric by Libanius before entering the ascetical school led by Diodore (later bishop of Tarsus). He was ordained a priest by Flavian of Antioch in 383 and then in 392 was consecrated bishop of Mopsuestia. In the course of his long episcopal tenure Theodore came to be regarded as one of the foremost theologians and exegetes of the pro-Nicene cause. In addition to numerous biblical commentaries on books of the Old and New Testaments, he produced a set of catechetical homilies explaining the Nicene Creed and the Lord's Prayer, polemical treatises such as *Against Eunomius* and *Dispute with the Macedonians*, as well as other works. Theodore's *On the Incarnation* was also polemical, according to the late fifth-century Gennadius of Marseilles:

Theodore, presbyter of the Antiochene church, a man prudent in knowledge and skillful in speech, wrote fifteen books *On the Incarnation of the Lord against the Apollinarians and Eunomians*, containing as many as fifteen thousand verses, in which he showed by the clearest reasoning and by the testimonies of scripture that just as the Lord Jesus had the fullness of deity, so too he had the fullness of humanity. He taught also that a human being consists only of two substances, that is, soul and body, and that mind and spirit are not different substances, but inborn faculties of the soul

through which it is inspired and is rational and makes the body capable of sensation. Moreover, the fourteenth book of this work is properly devoted to discussing the uncreated and alone incorporeal and all-ruling nature of the holy Trinity and also the rationality of creatures, which he explains insightfully on the authority of the holy scriptures. But in the fifteenth volume he confirms and strengthens the whole body of his work by citing the traditions of the fathers.¹

According to Gennadius, then, Theodore wrote the massive *On the Incarnation* before his appointment as bishop while he was still a presbyter; thus his work represents a pro-Nicene Christological outlook of the 380s or early 390s. This was the period in which pro-Nicenes were actively confronting the Christologies of the Apollinarians and Heteroousians (also called Eunomians) as live options, such as was done by Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. And herein lies the importance of this work: it is a crucial non-Cappadocian witness to emerging pro-Nicene Christology as it developed in response to the perceived threats of Apollinarius and Eunomius but decades before dyophysite language became problematized through Nestorius. We see in Theodore, then, a Christology that is very much a work-in-progress as he attempts to work out the categories, concepts, and contours with which to articulate his understanding of Christ.

A few years after Theodore's death in 428, Cyril of Alexandria identified him, in spite of his reputation for unimpeachable orthodoxy during his lifetime, as a forerunner of Nestorius, an association that quickly tainted the legacy of Theodore. This eventually led to the condemnation of Theodore's person and writings as one of the so-called Three Chapters at the Council of Constantinople in 553.² Accordingly, some works of his, including *On the Incarnation*, survive only in Greek, Latin, and Syriac fragments, the latter due to the esteem in which Theodore was held by the Church of the East.

Fragments of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* survive in various treatises and collections. All the Greek fragments are preserved in Leontius of Byzantium's *Unmasking and Triumph over the Nestorians* from the early 540s.

1 Gennadius of Marseilles, *On Illustrious Men* 12 (PL 58: 1067–1068).

2 See *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople*, translated in CEECW 4 on pp. 341–389.

There are Latin fragments in Facundus of Hermiane's *In Defense of the Three Chapters* from 550, as well as in the Acts of the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth sessions of the Council of Constantinople in 553. Syriac fragments are found in the fifth-century florilegium known as *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* and in British Library Cod. Add. 14669, a mutilated sixth- or seventh-century manuscript that originally contained a complete Syriac translation of *On the Incarnation*. In most cases, the original location of the fragment is indicated, whether the book number or the section number or both. (It appears that, in addition to its division into fifteen books, *On the Incarnation* was also divided into sections, numbered sequentially from the beginning to the end of the treatise, and thus overlapped with the division into fifteen books.) Accordingly, the extant fragments below are placed in their original order as far as can be determined. Several fragments lack any internal indication of their original order, but sometimes the contents of a fragment offer clues to its approximate original location. In these cases a justification for where the fragment is placed in this translation appears in a footnote. In three cases no conjecture could be made about the original location of the fragment; these are simply placed after all the others. The original location of each fragment, if known, is indicated in the title of each fragment.

There are 73 unique fragments in total. Some are preserved in multiple languages. The translations below are always based on the original Greek if it is available. If a fragment is not extant in Greek, then the translation is based on the Latin version if one is available. Only in cases where neither the Greek original nor a Latin version is available is the translation below based on the Syriac. In a few cases fragments preserved in British Library Cod. Add. 14669 (whose Syriac translation of the original Greek is lacunose and difficult) can be presented with two columns, the left-hand column containing parallel fragments preserved in Greek, Latin, or a different Syriac translation. Whenever possible, the translators have made reference to the different language versions of the same fragment to gain insight from the ancient translators' interpretations.

With the exception of the Syriac fragments in British Library Cod. Add. 14669, the fragments of *On the Incarnation* were preserved by someone opposed to Theodore's views. Accordingly, since these fragments were selected and quoted precisely because they were deemed to reveal the most problematic aspects of Theodore's Christology, a reader must work carefully with these fragments and not interpret them through the polemical

lens intended by those who preserved them. In the case of all the fragments, they are removed from their original contexts, which often makes reading them difficult – it is like hearing only a snippet of a wider conversation. They can seem cryptic, and a reader will have to work to reconstruct the questions or problems they are attempting to answer.

While it is difficult to summarize the Christological teaching of a treatise that survives in such a fragmentary state, certain repeated themes can be highlighted here. For Theodore, the purpose of the incarnation was soteriological, to undo the fallen human condition into which humanity sank in consequence of the sin of Adam. He insists that in Christ there is a union of two distinct, intact, and complete natures (humanity and divinity) in a single person. Against Apollinarians and Eunomians, he affirms that Christ had a human soul. In fact, he teaches that Christ struggled with desire in both flesh and soul yet overcame those temptations through the assistance of the indwelling divinity. Thus did the assumed human being achieve moral perfection. The union of humanity and divinity in Christ began at the moment of the conception of the assumed human being, enabling the human being to be preternaturally endowed with moral excellence. At the same time this union is presented as a reward for the assumed human being, whom God foreknew would make moral progress and advance to human perfection with the assistance of the indwelling Word. The precise details of this cooperation between the indwelling Word and indwelt human being remain somewhat fuzzy.

Theodore also spends considerable energy identifying the proper conceptual categories to use when trying to understand the incarnation. He speaks of it in terms of a “union,” “conjunction,” “assumption,” or “indwelling,” but he rejects “mixture.” Theodore is known for speaking of God indwelling in Christ “by good pleasure” and that concept is also on display in these fragments. What he means by this is that God indwells in Christ according to the favorable disposition of his will, not by substance or activity. God also indwells the prophets, apostles, and saints by good pleasure, but not in the same way that he indwells in Christ by good pleasure. For in Christ God indwells by good pleasure “as in a Son” (Heb 1:2), by which Theodore means that there is a union of the indweller and the assumed human being, who thereby comes to share in every honor and title of God and becomes one person with him. Thus Christ can be called “Son of God” (by grace) because of his conjunction with the Word (who is Son of God by nature). Theodore resists the charge that his Christology implies that

there are two sons. Likewise, the incarnate Word can also be called a “human being,” though Theodore is clear that he is not a “mere human being.”

The Greek and Latin fragments have been edited by Till Jansen, *Theodor von Mopsuestia De Incarnatione* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009),³ and all the original language fragments of *On the Incarnation* by John Behr, *The Case against Diodore and Theodore* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). The following translations are based on Behr, with reference to Jansen when possible and to Brian Daley’s edition of the works of Leontius of Byzantium (*Leontius of Byzantium: Complete Works* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017]) in the case of the fragments preserved by him. See the Appendix to this translation for a table correlating our fragment numbers both to the codes that Behr assigned to each fragment and to Jansen’s numbering of the fragments. The table also lists the internal indications of the original location of each fragment.

TRANSLATION

Fragment 1

From Book 1

(Translated from Syriac)

Since many have gone astray in various ways about the doctrine of the incarnation <...>

Fragment 2

From Book 1, Section 11

(Translated from Latin)

So then, just as Nathanael, by a confession such as this one,⁴ is revealed to be lacking knowledge of his divinity (in hoping for such things, Jews and Samaritans were as far as possible from the knowledge of God the Word), so too Martha, by her confession,⁵ is shown at that time to be lacking knowledge of his divinity, and moreover it is obvious that not even the

3 Jansen’s Fragment II is omitted because it consists of excerpts from Theodore’s homilies; it is not a fragment of *On the Incarnation*; see Richard Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 258 n. 147.

4 See John 1:49, “Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are King of Israel.”

5 See John 11:27, “You are the Christ, the Son of God, the one coming into the world.”

blessed Peter [had knowledge of his divinity].⁶ For until that point it was enough for those who received that revelation back then to understand that there was something exceptional and superior about him beyond the imagination of other human beings. But it was only after the resurrection, when they had been brought by the Spirit to knowledge, that they received perfect knowledge of the revelation. At that point they came to know that something exceptional had come to him beyond [that which comes to] other human beings, not in terms of some simple honor from God as is the case with other human beings, but through union with God the Word, through which participation in every honor is given to him after his ascension into heaven.

Fragment 3

From the Beginning of Section 33

(Translated from Syriac)

The Apostle said, “Just as sin arose in the world through one human being, and through sin, death,”⁷ so too did grace abound for many through one human being, Jesus Christ.⁸ In light of this it is normal that people ask about the implications of the words of the apostles even when they in fact know, and declare that they are persuaded by, the apostolic sayings. When they are not persuaded, though, asking us, “What is the answer to the problem?” we are happy to respond to this question, considering it our pride [to offer] a defense on behalf of the apostolic words. And so, we say: It was right that the human being had to find a solution, through his way of life, for his disobedience. But the mere human being was not able to conquer sin’s power when he struggled with it, since it had been implanted in our very nature for such a long time. [Sin] possessed the soul, since [the soul] became easily subjugated to that which it had wanted to struggle with – for behold, it was conquered by fighting against it. The indwelling of God the Word became necessary, so that, with humanity’s disposition to correct conduct preserved unharmed through the aid of God the Word who had made it fully capable, humanity might easily escape sin and find a solution to the disobedience that came about through the first of those formed like us.⁹

6 See Matt 16:16, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” See also Mark 8:29 and Luke 9:20.

7 Rom 5:12. 8 See Rom 5:14. 9 That is, Adam.

Fragment 4

From Section 35

(Translated from Syriac)

For our Lord's struggles were similar; they were not more useful than ours, though they were somewhat more noticeable. Even if it is not possible to say this, it is obvious that he took up a great struggle on our behalf against the passions of the soul. That struggle taken up against the passions of the flesh was less serious, given how much more it took to endure those of the soul. This is because the soul needed more healing. But it is obvious that, once he had taken up flesh and soul, he struggled in both and for both, mortifying sin in the flesh and subjecting its desires, making them easily conquerable by the superior reason of the soul. He was disciplining the soul, training it so it could subjugate its own passions and oppress the desires of the flesh. For when the divinity indwelt these things, it began to rule each of them. The grace of the Holy Spirit was also assisting with this, just as the blessed Apostle said too: "Great indeed is the mystery of godliness: he who was revealed in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit."¹⁰ Because we ourselves are also going to receive the assistance of the Spirit to attain to the perfection of righteousness <...>

Fragment 5

From Section 36

(Translated from Syriac)

Since later he was going to give the assistance of the Spirit to human beings, who were going to need it for the fulfillment of perfect excellence,¹¹ first he gave it to the one who was assumed.

Fragment 6

From Section 36

(Translated from Syriac)

Like when he was speaking with his disciples about the gift of the Spirit, which was going to come to them, he said, "He will glorify me, for he will

10 1 Tim 3:16.

11 Alternatively, "virtue."

take what is mine and declare it to you.”¹² He did not say “from me” but “from what is mine.”

Fragment 7

From Section 37

(Translated from Syriac)

Yet he also said that he performs miracles by the Spirit of God. He said, “But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons”¹³ So who is silly enough to say about God the Word that he casts out demons by the Spirit of God? Because this is a human thing: human beings do not have sufficient power of their own to perform miracles. It is proper, though, to speak this way of the one who was assumed.

Fragment 8

From Section 38

(Translated from Syriac)

The saying of our Lord – “Do not fear those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; rather, fear more the one who can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna” – also indicates this.¹⁴ Thus their silly thought is proved wrong. For he who considers the will of the soul also thereby condemns the assumption of the flesh with the soul, which is superior to the flesh. They should not think this way! For excellence¹⁵ is from the will, but the will also needs God’s assistance for it, since it is drawn by inclination toward sin. Therefore, when our Lord assumed humanity, he gave it a great grace, namely, he removed the embedded sin from its flesh, and from its soul [he removed] the easy tendency toward the passions and the inclination toward sin. In this way he removed, on the one hand, the fervor of desire from the flesh where it resides, and on the other, he voided the grip of the passions on the soul. It was not that he removed the passions and impulses themselves, for [the body and soul] are still driven by both of them. But he has driven away their power and has given the soul suitable instruction by his own way of life. He made [the soul] invincible to its own passions, and by the superiority of good thoughts the attack of wicked [thoughts] will be repelled, so as to corral the desire of the flesh in the intention toward the good, being supported by the assistance of the Spirit.

¹² John 16:14.

¹³ Matt 12:28.

¹⁴ Matt 10:28.

¹⁵ Alternatively, “virtue.”

Fragment 9

From Sections 42–43

(Translated from Syriac)

By all means, the soul has rationality. For if mortal beings have natural movements in their own life, those which are immortal have it all the more, as their life is immortal. They have responsive and powerful minds. But maybe they'll say, "We didn't say that the soul does not have rationality." Well then, let them tell us why a third nature, which they call "mind," is required, and why they point to its sustenance, or why it assists and completes the human being. If the vitality of the body is administered by the soul, then the mind is also in [the soul], such that by it the divine nature is recognized; it also establishes all activity and administers all the guidance of the things that have been and those that will be – for these things all follow from the rational nature [that it has]. What then do the heretics say is the argument for the third nature that they invent and call "mind"?

The soul does not naturally have functions and activities like those of the body. Naturally, one calls the thing that sees "the eye," and naturally one calls the thing that hears "the ear," and naturally one calls the thing that is moved to make words "the tongue." Each of the members naturally has movements that move it. And if the soul in its turn is the same, it would require something else for its sustenance and vitality, just as these members also require the soul, by which they are sustained and are moved to the use of their actions. When the soul is removed, the remaining members of the body are not just voided, but they are truly destroyed; they [by themselves] were not sufficient for the form and sustenance of their soul.¹⁶

And as the soul is not so¹⁷ – indeed, it is not, for it naturally lives in its hypostasis¹⁸ by God's grace, administering life and sustenance for the body – then it is clear that it is immortal and does not have natural movements. Instead in the mind it turns to whatever it chooses.

But the heretics do not grant these things nor deem them fitting. What's more, they do not consider the teaching of the sacred books. Rather, for the demonstration of their position – that the human being is constituted from three natures – they summon for us a testimony from the blessed

¹⁶ The soul that inhabited them.

¹⁷ That is, requiring something else for its sustenance and vitality.

¹⁸ In Syriac, *qnoma*.

Paul, in which he said, “May the God of peace sanctify you entirely, and may all your spirit and soul and body be without fault until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹⁹ [43]²⁰ And this testimony, which they cite in order to question us, they “understand” foolishly.

And they summon another text, that Jesus “grew in stature and wisdom and in grace, before God and before human beings.”²¹ They are not Apollinarians, who deny the mind of the soul. Nor are they Eunomians, who like to inquire into and examine the assumption of the soul, similarly to those who reject that the soul was assumed. Both groups know that this testimony is contrary to their teaching. For if, according to [the second group’s] position, he did not assume a soul, or, according to what [the others] say, he assumed a soul but not a mind – as if there is anyone who says that the soul of the human being can exist with no mind! – how then did Jesus “grow in wisdom”? If he says that it was the divinity that grew in wisdom – well, even they wouldn’t dare to say this to us in their madness. And the body didn’t “grow in wisdom,” that much is clear. So, it seems obvious that he assumed a rational soul, for that is how it was possible that he could “grow in wisdom,” namely in that he received by the mind the teaching of wisdom.

Yet persisting they also say that he visibly “grew” in the estimation of human beings, while not taking in that which was [actually] said, namely “in stature and wisdom and grace,” and “before God and before human beings.” If they confess about him that he truly “grew in stature and wisdom and grace,” then obviously just as he really did grow in stature, not just in estimation, so also did he likewise truly grow in wisdom. The evangelist had prudently guarded his words and did not allow any opportunity to the wickedness of their craft, in that he said, “before God and before human beings.” Let us think regarding their position that it was in estimation before human beings that he grew. Surely, it is not that he could grow in estimation before God. For if it was before God that he grew and increased, it is clear <...>

Fragment 10
From Sections 49–50
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> that it is, or that because he is not complete, he has not given him the designation “Son.” Now, if they call God the Word “Son,” that one is

19 1 Thess 5:23.

20 Section 43 begins here.

21 Luke 2:52.

something else apart from the divine nature. Whether the body alone or the body and soul, it is not worthy of being called “the Son of God,” nor is it the perfected human being. What then should we say he is, according to their position? Quote for us a passage that is equal to these thoughts. If they say that the one who was assumed – whether they want to say it was the body, or the body with the soul – is conjoined and was complete in the one Son, how do they not grasp that this position is suitable and even agreeable to us? For we confess that the complete human being was assumed. After all, if the complete God the Word is by nature the Son of God, by birth he is from the Father. Thus, that which exists apart from that nature was not given its own personal name. Instead he is confessed by the name “Son of God” on account of his precise conjunction with God the Word.

Whatever is said regarding the Son of God obviously also applies to the one who was assumed, even as he was perfected. But we are not required to say “two sons” because of this, just as the two natures are soul and body, but are not the same as one another. This much is clear: even they confess this! For if the two natures which were assumed are not the same as one another, they are also not [the same as] God the Word who assumed them, nor do they constitute another person from them and for them, on account of their conjunction with God the Word. It is clear that not even the third nature – which is the mind, according to their position – does this, even if it is additional. For if there are two, body and soul, belonging to God the Word who assumed them, and he is truly the Son who is named and confessed to be with him according to the precise conjunction, it is obvious that even if this is a third nature, it does not in any way oppose our position in this matter. Just as these two natures are named and confessed with the name of the excellent nature – that is, of the one who assumed them – because of the precise conjunction, so too, even if there is a third nature, it is called “Son of God” and spoken of as though it is not separate from God the Word. And we do not concede anything else beyond “divine nature,” that in his own person itself and for him is known and named the “Son of God.” But by the name of “Son of God” we designate that one who was assumed, even if he is the one who is a complete human being. But if in their madness they say that “the mind is superior to the divinity of the Only-Begotten in that human being and it is right that from it, as from something superior, the other person of the human nature be named” – for such things are said to us – since we reject their position that “the mind is another nature beyond the soul and body,” we have already demonstrated above with the aid of God that they are not so.

[50] But they say that neither is it right to apply to Christ the name of the “human being,” nor is it fitting that he be called by this phrase.²² The fact that they think this is a demonstration of their ignorance and of how poorly acquainted they are with the holy scriptures. For it is plainly known to all who wish to perceive it that we find this name in many places in the holy scriptures. For our Lord said to the Jews, “Why do you wish to kill me? I am a human being who speaks the truth to you.”²³ And in a different place, when the Slanderer said, tempting him, “Make these stones into bread,” he answered him, “It is written that the human being does not live by bread alone.”²⁴ It is obvious that, if what was assumed was not a human being yet had a conflict with the Slanderer, [the Slanderer] would not fight with him to tempt him. For he thought that he was just what was visible and did not sense the divine nature that was residing in him. If he had known, he would not have dared to tempt him. Surely, strictly speaking, if he had sensed the divine nature, he would know also this: that he is above every temptation. Thus, he did not answer fittingly.

Fragment 11

From Section 50

(Translated from Syriac)

Just as death came through a human being, so too does the resurrection of the dead come through a human being. According to what is known, it is not fitting that resurrection be granted to humanity in any other way except by the one who is like in nature to the nature of the one who was the cause of death.²⁵ It is also right for him who is the cause of the resurrection to be the same.

Fragment 12

From Section 51

(Translated from Syriac)

For God is not said to wear flesh, for no one says, “God wears flesh.” Let us say once more, “the human being in whom God dwelled.” That is, it is not absurd for him to wear God, which is what they hasten to attack, as if it were clearly an absurdity. If he is said to be a human being, as we have

22 In Syriac, *bart qala*.

23 John 8:40.

24 Matt 4:4.

25 That is, Adam.

shown from the divine scripture, then it is in this one that God the Word dwelled. Whether “he is in him,” or however they choose to say it, it is not absurd to say the human being “wore” God, the one who dwelled in him.

Fragment 13

From Section 51

(Translated from Syriac)

For they ask this especially: Is Christ one thing and the Son of God another thing? Or is this one Christ and the other one the Son of God? If anyone answers and says, “He is one and the same,” then they immediately think their illness is upheld.

Fragment 14

From Book 5, Section 52

(Translated from Latin)

When someone distinguishes the natures, he necessarily finds one thing and another thing. And not even they,²⁶ I think, will object to this fact because we all agree that God the Word by nature is one thing and what is assumed is another thing, whatever it may be. At the same time, however, he is found to be the same as that [which is assumed] in terms of person, not by the natures being confused in any way but on account of the union that the assumed made with the assumer. For if we are honest when we agree that the latter is other than the former by nature, and it is clear that the assumed is not equal to the assumer, with neither the latter being similar to the former nor the assumed the same as the assumer, then it is clear that he will be found to be the same by reason of the union of the person. So then, it is appropriate to divide that which concerns Christ, for there is nothing contradictory in these divisions – after all, they are in utter harmony with the divine scriptures. In this way there will be neither a confusion of the natures nor a kind of wicked division of the person. For the principle of the natures must remain unconfused and it must be recognized that the person is undivided – the former by reason of the property of the nature, in that the assumed is distinct from the assumer, whereas the latter by reason of the union of the person, in that the nature, whether of the assumer or even that of the assumed, is accounted for in the single designation for the whole.

²⁶ Presumably Theodore’s opponents.

Accordingly, to use an example, as soon as we call upon God the Word using the designation “Son,” at the same time we co-signify the assumed nature, whatever it may be, on account of the union that it has with him.

Fragment 15
From Book 6, Section 54
(*Translated from Latin*)

So then, though they²⁷ seem to be justified in calling us “human-worshippers”²⁸ because we call Christ a human being, prior to our saying this, scripture taught all human beings [the same] through those [passages] in which it does not refuse to call [Christ] a human being, just as we have shown above that in many passages Christ is called by this name. But it is fitting, they say, for those who call Christ a mere human being to be called human-worshippers. Now, this is a blatant lie, if they really should want to say this! For no one has ever heard us say such things, and I do not think that even they could pretend to allow such a blatant lie, not because they are unacquainted with lying but because they see that they can be refuted most easily – although if they should be careless, perhaps it would come even to this! For we ourselves think that to say this, that is, to deny the divinity of the Only-Begotten, is the height of madness. Otherwise, what reason now remains for why we are separated from the heretics? For what reason have we endured both such great and so many persecutions? Or who does not know that war is constantly waged against us by the heretics? Every mine and every deserted place is filled with our people on account of the doctrine of piety.²⁹

Fragment 16
From an Unknown Book or Section³⁰
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> many were taken up. And there was a slight diminishment of the danger that the whole mass of the people would perish in this error. The

27 Presumably Theodore’s opponents. 28 In Latin, *hominicolae*.

29 That is, allies of Theodore have been sentenced to work in the mines or sent into faraway exile for their views.

30 Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, it is connected with Fragment 17, which also deals with Meletius of Antioch. Since Fragment 17 sums up the discussion of Meletius, it seems best to place this fragment before it.

entire East was confused with this opinion.³¹ And some of those who were reckoned to have perfect knowledge of the faith in regard to the Son of God but whose understanding in regard to the Holy Spirit was not [yet] sound were only later confirmed and perfected in the knowledge of the truth.³² At that time, the blessed bishop Meletius preached this faith with great boldness of speech, forsaking the honor that he had before the emperor or the magistrates. And even though he was aware that after his preaching he would be excluded from the honor and love of the emperor and the magistrates, he despised all this, and with bravery and excellence he preached the faith of the church. It is right that we accurately cite the words of his homily to explain and confirm what we are saying. For he said, "They are understood to be three, but we speak of them as one."³³ And immediately there was a great upheaval in the church and the uproar of the people kept getting louder and louder, for they were all amazed at the boldness of his doctrine, and the grace of God was established in the minds of all the people. But the enemies of the truth groaned very bitterly when they saw that all their schemes would be dissolved in a short time. For the bravery of his preaching and the boldness of his teaching were the confirmation of the fear of God³⁴ and a great rebuke of those who little by little were chipping away at the solid foundation of the faith. The words of his teaching could not be heard on account of the people's uproar. Not even if someone had used a horn would it have been possible to hear because of how loud the great uproar was. And then the blessed bishop Meletius fulfilled the function of the tongue with his holy hands, as he wished that all his members might become a mouth and that he might preach the truth through all of them.³⁵ And this blessed one was made holy by the confession of his

31 The "opinion" mentioned by Theodore is "Arianism."

32 Theodore is talking about some group active in the early 360s which later generations would call Pneumatomachians, Macedonians, or Homoiousians but which eventually adopted the pro-Nicene position. In the next sentence he appears to place Meletius in this group.

33 These words were spoken after Meletius preached the homily before Emperor Constantius II that is preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.29–33; see Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.31 and Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.28. Theodoret preserves the original Greek of Meletius's words: *tria ta noumena bōs beni de dialegometha* (GCS n.F. 5: 172, 12–13 Parmentier/Hansen).

34 "Fear of God" here means "true piety."

35 As reported by Theodoret and Sozomen (see note 33 above), an "Arian" archdeacon attempted to stop Meletius from speaking by covering his mouth with his hand. Meletius

mouth, though before the confession of the church they³⁶ had been ruthlessly persecuted with the punishment of death, and they were not permitted to gather together for the service of prayer and the thanksgiving to the Lord God of all. For in Antioch of Syria, the emperors on many occasions had threatened and commanded that they be thrown in the river. For they used to assemble and gather at the river at that time. Our words do not suffice such as they are, but the deeds themselves already proclaim such words <...>

Regarding the blessed bishop Meletius (may his memory be a blessing!), who by his blessed way of life was [firmly established] in divine truth and who was much loved and greatly honored the emperor, why was he expelled from the city of Antioch and sent into exile?³⁷ Was it not the boldness of his preaching about the doctrine of the fear of God? For all the East was confused about the contents of the faith. Back then the heretics were not separated, but mixed together in one congregation were both those who with great care adhered to the teaching of faith in the fear of God and those who concealed the deceit of their error in their mind. Those of the right belief feared to preach the truth of their faith with boldness, since at that time the [heretics] were stronger than they were. [The heretics] knew that the crown and the magistrates belonged to the opposing opinion, and they were guided by the will of the emperor as if it were their own will, and also they subjugated their own opinion to that of many magistrates, [by accepting] abundant gifts for the provision of the church and all those who were ill in their opinions. For the people were not yet accustomed to understanding the blasphemy against the Son of God. For in this period when that wickedness began, they did not yet dare express their opinions openly but hid their deceitful error and little by little subtly dismantled the faith of the simple and drew them to the teaching that leads to perdition. And thus little by little this error <...>

then held up his own hand, showing three fingers, then one finger, thereby signaling the pro-Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

³⁶ That is, pro-Nicenes like Meletius.

³⁷ Meletius was exiled from Antioch only a few months after becoming its bishop in consequence of the homily he preached before Emperor Constantius II. At the time, Meletius was not viewed as unmistakably pro-Nicene, but by the Council of Constantinople in 381 he was widely regarded as a leader of that alliance.

Fragment 17
From Book 6, Section 54
(*Translated from Latin*)

Now when the blessed Meletius endured all these things from the heretics, he first and then many others along with him throughout the provinces, the cities, and the countryside, what was the reason? Was it not because they were confessing that Christ was true God? Was it not because they were preaching that he was the true Son of God, begotten from the paternal essence, always existing simultaneously with the generating Father, adding also the pious confession about the Holy Spirit? And so, having suffered so much on account of this confession, how can we suffer calumny from them as if we called [Christ] “a mere human being,” seeing that the facts themselves refute this patent calumny?

Fragment 18
From Section 56
(*Translated from Syriac*)

“We speak wisdom among those who are perfect.”³⁸ By “wisdom” he refers to the whole preaching about Christ, in which all people have been educated, namely, that as God the Word indwelled, he directed all things in the human being. The crucifixion matters, then, not because of the nature of the passible one, but because of the power of the one who assumed him.

Fragment 19
From an Unknown Book or Section³⁹
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> as also the arrival of the magi, which magnified and blessed the birth of the Messiah. They came from a distant place so that they might worship him according to the testimony of their words. [The birth of the Messiah] was revealed to many; the evangelist testified, saying, “Herod was disturbed

³⁸ 1 Cor 2:6.

³⁹ Though this fragment has no internal indication of its original location, its content – the evidence that should have convinced the Jews to believe in Jesus Christ as God – indicates that it should be placed before Fragment 20, which implies a previous discussion of the same evidence.

and all Jerusalem with him.”⁴⁰ And many other deeds were seen after “the testimony of John [the Baptist].”⁴¹ First, our Lord performed miracles that were quite novel and wondrous. What’s more, what his disciples performed in his name were clearly great miracles; he gave them the authority to do these when he said, “Cast out demons, cleanse the lepers, cure the sick; you have freely received, so give freely.”⁴² And the fact that the blessed apostles clearly accomplished these things in his name is even more impressive than what [John the Baptist] could do. For it does not seem that anyone could ever perform miracles in the name of a human being: Joshua son of Nun did not in the name of Moses, and Elisha did not in the name of Elijah. But in fact [Elisha] did receive the gift of his spirit in double [portion].⁴³

Therefore, since all these things also made it known to the Jews that Christ was the Lord, inasmuch as he was greatly superior to Moses and all the prophets, they have no just excuse for their hardheartedness and their lack of obedience toward our Lord. It would have been right for them to obey him, since he was grander and greater than Moses and all the prophets who had come before. Because of the things he said, he was worthy of faith. [But] they abandoned the things that were necessary and thought of him in such a way as to crucify him, though there was no just cause of their hardheartedness. Yet what brought down the penalty upon them even more severely was that after the crucifixion and death of our Lord, the apostles had clearly performed signs before them, with even the shadow of the blessed Peter curing the sick before their eyes.⁴⁴ Despite all these things, the Jews abided in their evil opinion; though they had seen all these great wonders, they still subjected this apostle to shame and to imprisonment many times. But if they had wanted to repent after the crucifixion, their repentance would have been received. For we saw blessed Peter do this.⁴⁵

And [when] all those in Judaea, the scribes, and the Pharisees together with Sadducees, and all the nation of the Jews [went out to John the Baptist],⁴⁶ he not only testified that [Christ] was manifest, but he also confessed that he was much greater than him: “He is so much greater that I am not worthy to loosen the straps of his sandals.”⁴⁷ It is not that the testimony of John was received without any doubt; rather, John, who made his faith abundantly known to the Jews in all his testimony, testified about [Christ] without any

40 Matt 2:3. 41 John 1:19. 42 Matt 10:8. 43 See 2 Kgs 2:9.

44 See Acts 5:15. 45 This must refer to Peter’s repentance for denying Christ.

46 See Matt 3:5–7; Mark 1:5; John 1:19, 24. 47 Luke 3:16.

doubt. It would have been right for them to have faith in him and obey him. And it was not only a question of John's testimony, but after this a pronouncement of the Father from heaven clearly confirmed John's testimony. It said, "This is my Son, my beloved, in whom I am well pleased."⁴⁸ And in the descent of the Spirit that testimony was made abundantly manifest and confirmed – the Spirit which clearly came in the likeness of the dove.⁴⁹ What greater testimonies than these could be needed? From human beings, John testified, he who was greater than all human beings of that era.⁵⁰ From heaven, [there are the testimonies of] God, whom the Jews acknowledged as Lord of all, and the Holy Spirit, who was described as God in the Old Testament and who gave the gift of prophecy to all the prophets.

Even the events before these were not insignificant.⁵¹ For before John, Zechariah his father was informed by the angel about John's birth, which was also revealed to the whole nation of the Jews in its impiety. This was said to him about John: "He will be great in the sight of the Lord, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit; he will go before him in the power and the spirit of Elijah the prophet to prepare for the Lord a perfected people."⁵² It is clear that these words bring a great understanding about Christ to light. For inasmuch as John was excellent and great in the eyes of the Jews, the fact that he was testifying about our Lord, namely that he was greatly and immeasurably superior to him,⁵³ clearly confirms his testimony about our Lord. And along with all these things the angel also testified about the birth of our Lord when he appeared to the shepherds and said, "Today is born to you a Savior who is Christ the Lord."⁵⁴ And the shepherds quickly came to the city and told everyone.⁵⁵ And it was clear that these things were being reported throughout all of Judaea, for new things are wont to be reported and recounted by many mouths.

Fragment 20
From the Ending of Book 6
(Translated from Syriac)

<...> in it,⁵⁶ their faith and their repentance were acceptable. Now, because of all these things judgment is deservedly assigned to the [Jews], and the

48 Matt 3:17. 49 See Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32.

50 See Matt 11:11; Luke 7:28.

51 That is, the events before the testimony of John the Baptist.

52 Luke 1:15–17, with omissions. 53 That is, Jesus was superior to John.

54 Luke 2:11. 55 See Luke 2:15–18. 56 Or, "in him."

punishment equal to their presumption has been prepared for them, as they persisted in a rigid opinion through all of them. They were persuaded neither by the great wonders, nor by the appearance of the angels,⁵⁷ nor by the arrival of the magi, who had come from a foreign country and a distant land and would not have been aware of our Lord's birth if they had not been informed by a star and a revelation.⁵⁸ Nor were they persuaded by the voice of his Father, the Spirit's arrival, or John's testimony,⁵⁹ let alone the great miracles that our Lord clearly performed, along with those that his disciples performed in his name, before the crucifixion and after it, and all the great signs that happened at the time of the crucifixion. These things validate their condemnation and punishment even more, [a punishment] which in a little while <...> And what's more, in their perversity they used sizeable bribes to persuade the Romans guarding [the tomb] to conceal his resurrection and to act treacherously by saying, "the disciples came; they stole him in the night."⁶⁰

All these things should have been enough to bring them to the faith that was superior to that of Moses and all the prophets. It would have been good for them to believe the things that he said, and if they had followed his faith they would have been brought little by little to understanding and knowledge of God the Word, like the apostles and the rest who had faith in him. All these things by which the Jews were not persuaded were insignificant to the heretics, and because of that, they rightfully receive the decree of judgment and great punishment for their guilt. Neither by Moses nor by the rest of the prophets, and after Moses not until the coming of our Lord, do we find such things as these performed by which Christ our Lord is clearly manifest, who is beyond comparison with Moses and superior to all the prophets.

The wicked <...> except those who in their ignorance about this do not see any of these things. But they say, "If they crucified a human being, they are not condemned to judgment. Just as those who killed someone wicked are not condemned, so too those who inflicted shame on the blessed apostles are not going to receive punishment." We learn from Christ our Lord clearly that those who insult and cause the blessed apostles distress receive the same punishment as anyone who offends our Lord. They receive

57 See Matt 1:20-24; Luke 1:11-20, 1:26-38, 2:9-15. 58 See Matt 2:1-2 and 9-12.

59 Matt 3:13-17; Mark 1:9-11; Luke 3:21-22; John 1:29-34.

60 See Matt 28:13.

punishment and censure; likewise, whoever honored the Lord receives a good reward. Accordingly, those who received the apostles sent by him and honored them receive the wages and good reward [of what they have done], as he clearly says, “He who receives you also receives me, and he who receives me receives the one who sent me.”⁶¹ And in another place he says, “Whatever you have done to one of the least of these who have faith in me, you have done it to me, and what you have not done for one of the least of these, you have not done it for me.”⁶² <...> “[Amen, I say to you, it will be more tolerable] for Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgment than for them.”⁶³ If [we are talking about] the ones who contemned and dishonored those who had faith in him, this fitting punishment has been prepared for them, which it is right for those who contemned him to receive.

How, then, does the one who sins against a human being [receive] judgment and condemnation and punishment? The heretics say that if the Jews crucified a human being, there is no condemnation or punishment for them. But the truth of what has been said is clear. We have sufficiently shown that, even though they did not have knowledge of God the Word, and even though they did not perceive the divine nature that was dwelling in the human being, the Jews rightly received a punishment that was equal to their presumption. They could have come to knowledge of the truth and to faith in Christ by means of so many things. But they scorned and were not willing to be persuaded. For this reason they have no excuse for the wicked things they did in their presumption <...>

*End of the Sixth Book.*⁶⁴

Fragment 21

From Book 7

(Translated from Greek)

For if we can learn how the indwelling comes about, we shall also know the manner [of the indwelling] and how that manner [of indwelling] is distinct. Now some have claimed that the indwelling happened by substance, whereas others claim it was by activity. Let us, then, examine whether one of these is true. But first let us come to agreement on this point, whether or not [God] indwells in all people. Well, it is clear that he does not indwell

61 Matt 10:40. 62 Matt 25:40, 45. 63 Matt 10:15.

64 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

in all people. For God promises this as something special to the saints, or in general to those whom he wants to be dedicated to him. Otherwise, why did he ever promise, as though he were going to grant them something special, “I shall indwell in them and I shall walk among them, and I shall be their God and they shall be my people,”⁶⁵ if all human beings really share in this collectively? Therefore, if he does not indwell in all (for this is clear) – I do not mean in [all] beings only, but not even in [all] human beings – then there must be some distinctive principle of indwelling, according to which he is present only in those in whom he is said to indwell.

So then, to say that God indwells by substance is utterly inappropriate. For either his substance would necessarily be confined only to those in whom he is said to indwell and he will be outside all others – which is absurd to say about the infinite nature that is present everywhere and circumscribed by no place. Or else, if we were to say that God is present everywhere by reason of his substance, then all things would participate in his indwelling too, not only human beings but also even irrational creatures and lifeless things, if indeed we should say that he makes his indwelling by substance. Now both of these are clearly inappropriate. For saying that God indwells all things is recognized as sheer absurdity, and to circumscribe his substance is inappropriate or rather impious. Therefore, it would be utterly silly to say that the indwelling happens by substance.

And one could also say the same thing in regard to activity. For again, either his activity would necessarily be limited only to those [in whom he indwells], and [in this case] how would we uphold the principle that God foresees all things and arranges all things and works in all things that which is proper? Or else, if all things participated in his activity – now this is fitting and suitable, since all things are empowered by him to exist, each of them, and to act according to their proper nature – then we would be saying that he indwells all things. Therefore, it is impossible to say that God makes his indwelling either by substance or by activity.

So then, what’s left? What principle shall we use that is regarded as preserving the distinctive [manner of indwelling] in these cases? Clearly, then, it is appropriate to speak of the indwelling as happening by good pleasure.⁶⁶ Good pleasure refers to the best and noblest act of will that God can make when he is pleased with those striving to be dedicated to him

65 Lev 26:11–12, which is quoted in 2 Cor 6:16.

66 In Greek, *eudokia*.

based on his good and noble opinion of them. This [understanding of good pleasure] is derived from scripture according to its customary usage and lies within it. So the blessed David speaks in this way, “His delight shall not be in the strength of the horse, nor his good pleasure in the legs of a man, but the Lord’s good pleasure is in those who fear him and in those who hope in his mercy.”⁶⁷ By this [David] means that [the Lord] refuses to work with some and declines to assist others, but does [work with and assist] those “who fear him,” as he says. These he holds in high regard, these he has decided to assist and come to the aid of. This is the proper way, then, to speak of the indwelling. For being infinite and uncircumscribed by nature he is present to all, but by good pleasure he is far from some and near to others. In line with this idea it is said, “The Lord is near to the broken-hearted and those whose spirit is crushed he will save.”⁶⁸ And elsewhere, “Do not cast me away from your presence nor deprive me of your Holy Spirit.”⁶⁹ By means of intention⁷⁰ he is near those worthy of this nearness and in turn far from sinners: it is not by nature that he is separated and not by nature that he is brought closer, but he makes both happen by the disposition of his will.⁷¹ So just as he is near and far by good pleasure (now it is quite clear from what’s been said what we mean by good pleasure; that’s why we discussed the meaning of the term with complete precision), so too by good pleasure he accomplishes the indwelling, not by circumscribing his substance or activity in those [whom he indwells] while being separated from all others, but rather by being present to all by substance while being separated from the unworthy by the disposition of his will. For in this way is his limitlessness better preserved, when it is made plain that he is not enslaved by some necessity to the limitlessness of his nature. For if it were the case that, because he is present everywhere by substance, he is also present everywhere by good pleasure, he would be found enslaved to necessity differently because he would no longer bring about his presence by his will but by the infinitude of his nature, having his will dragged along. But since he is present by nature to all and separated from those whom he wants [to be separated from] by his will, and since none of those who are unworthy benefits from God being present, the limitlessness of his nature

67 Ps 146(147):10–11. 68 Ps 33(34):19. 69 Ps 50(51):13.

70 In Greek, *diathesei*.

71 In Greek, *teî scheseî tēs gnōmēs*, which in the ancient Latin version of Fragment 69 is translated *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

is preserved true and inviolate for him. In this way, then, by good pleasure he is present to some and separated from others, just as if he was with them by substance but separated from the rest.

Just as the indwelling comes about by good pleasure, so too does the good pleasure modify the manner of the indwelling. For that which brings about God's indwelling and that which makes it known that the one who is present everywhere by reason of his substance also indwells in a very small number of all the people – the good pleasure, I mean – this surely leaves its mark also on the manner of the indwelling. For just as he is present in all by substance without being said to indwell in all but [only] in those to whom he is present by good pleasure, so too, even if he is said to indwell, the circumstances of the indwelling are surely not identical but the manner of indwelling will also be consistent with the good pleasure. So when he is said to indwell in the prophets or in the apostles or in the righteous generally, he brings about the indwelling because he is well pleased⁷² with the righteous, because he is satisfied, as is appropriate, with the virtuous. In [Christ], however, we do not say that the indwelling came about in this way – may we never be so insane! – but “as in a Son.”⁷³ For that is the way he indwelt [in him] when he was well pleased⁷⁴ [with him]. But what does “as in a Son” mean? That he who indwelt united to himself the whole of the one assumed and caused him to share along with him in every honor in which the indweller himself, being Son by nature, participates, with the result that he effects one person by way of the union with him, and shares all his rule with him, and in this way accomplishes everything in him so that even the judgment and examination of all will be performed through him and his presence, even though the difference in their natural characteristics is clearly recognized.

Fragment 22

From Book 7, Section 59

(Translated from Greek)

As for us, then,⁷⁵ even though we will be perfectly governed by the Spirit in both body and soul in the age to come, nonetheless we now have a kind

⁷² The Greek participle *eudokōn* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

⁷³ See Heb 1:2.

⁷⁴ The Greek participle *eudokēsas* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

⁷⁵ Reading *toinun* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *toinēn*.

of partial first fruits of this, as it were, according to which by the aid of the Spirit we are under no compulsion to succumb to the disturbances of the soul. In the same way too the Lord, even though after these things⁷⁶ he had God the Word fully and wholly active in himself, with every activity of his inseparable from him, nonetheless even before this⁷⁷ he had him as much as possible accomplishing in himself most of what was required: in the period before the cross he was allowed, because of his need, to achieve virtue for our sake by his own intention,⁷⁸ but even in these matters he was supported by him and strengthened so that he could completely fulfill all the necessary things.

For right from the start, at the construction⁷⁹ in the womb, he had union with him. And when he reached the age at which discernment between what is good and what is not good naturally develops in human beings – rather, even before that age – he demonstrated a power to discern such things far more quickly and swiftly than the rest of human beings. In regard to the rest of human beings, the power of discernment does not develop in everyone in the same way at the same time: some grasp what is right more swiftly by greater intelligence, whereas others acquire this over a longer period of time by training. But this [power of discernment] came to him, in comparison to the rest, extraordinarily sooner than the typical age for human beings. It makes sense that he should have had something extra in human terms since he had not been born according to the nature typical of human beings, from the coupling of man and woman; rather, he was constructed by the divine action of the Spirit. In addition, he had an extraordinary propensity toward the good through his union with God the Word, of which he was deemed worthy by foreknowledge when God the Word from on high united him to himself. And so, because of all these things, along with discernment he immediately possessed a great hatred toward evil, and because he had conjoined himself to the good with irrepressible affection and received assistance from God the Word proportionate to his own intention, he was then preserved unaltered from any change for

76 That is, after the saving events of the economy.

77 That is, before the resurrection.

78 The Greek term here is *prothesis*, translated as “intention” when it appears in the Greek fragments. In one case “intention” translates *diathesis*: see note 70 above.

79 The Greek term *diaplasia*, “construction,” refers to the seed’s development into the embryo; it was regarded as the first stage of fetal development after conception.

the worse. This is the way he maintained [his own] will, and this is the way his intention was preserved by the assistance of God the Word.

And furthermore he pursued the most exacting form of virtue with the greatest ease, whether in keeping the law before his baptism or in pursuing a life in grace after his baptism; in this he provided us with a pattern, presenting himself as a kind of path for us in this regard. So, finally, after his resurrection and assumption into heaven, having shown himself worthy of the union on account of his own will – though he had received this union even before this, at his very construction [in the womb], by the good pleasure of the Master – finally he provides an exact demonstration of [what] the union [means], that no activity of his is separated or severed from God the Word and that he has God the Word accomplishing all things in himself through the union with himself. Accordingly, then, prior to the cross we see that he is hungry, we know that he is thirsty, we learn that he is afraid, and we discover that he is ignorant, since his intention for virtue comes from himself.⁸⁰

And the prophet Isaiah is a witness to what has been said, saying, “For before the child knows good or bad, he refuses evil in order to choose the good.”⁸¹ Clearly, it is by discernment that he hated the former and loved the latter. For surely a choice happens by discerning what is worse. So then, how does he accomplish this “before the child knows”? Here’s how: before he reached that age at which it is customary for the rest of human beings to acquire discernment between courses of action, he had something extra and exceptional in comparison to the rest of human beings. For if even among us we often find children of that age who give proof of great conscientiousness, such that they provoke wonder in onlookers because they display an innate intelligence superior to their age, by how much more must that human being⁸² have surpassed all the human beings of his time.

Fragment 23
From Book 7, Section 59
(*Translated from Greek*)

“And Jesus progressed in age and in wisdom and in grace before God and human beings.”⁸³ For he progressed “in age” as time marched on, and “in

80 Literally, “since he contributed to his intention for virtue from himself.”

81 Isa 7:16. 82 That is, Jesus. 83 Luke 2:52.

wisdom” by acquiring conscientiousness with the passage of time, and “in grace” by pursuing virtue in a way consistent with his conscientiousness and knowledge. Because of this God’s grace increased within him. And in all these [ways] he “progressed before God and human beings,” with the latter observing his progress and the former not only observing [his progress] but also testifying to it and assisting with [all] that happened. This much is clear, then, that he achieved virtue with more precision and with greater ease than was possible for the rest of human beings inasmuch as God the Word, due to his foreknowledge of what sort of individual he would be, united him to himself right at the start of the construction⁸⁴ and supplied him with greater assistance from himself for the accomplishment of what was right, arranging all that concerned him for the salvation of all. And he urged him on to more perfect things while relieving him of the greater part of his toils, whether of soul or of body. And in this way he prepared for him a greater and easier achievement of virtue.

Fragment 24

From Book 7, Section 60

(Translated from Greek)

For the one assumed according to foreknowledge was united from the beginning to God, having received the commencement of the union at his very construction⁸⁵ in the womb. Because he had already been judged worthy of the union, he received all things that⁸⁶ it made sense for a human being united to the Only-Begotten and the Master of the Universe to receive. And being judged worthy of greater things in comparison to the rest by far, the exceptional [gift] of the union came to him. Indeed, compared to the rest of human beings he was the first to be judged worthy of the indwelling of the Spirit and of this he was judged worthy in a way unlike the rest. For he received in himself the whole gift of the Spirit, but to others he gave a partial share in that whole Spirit. And in this way it came to pass that the whole Spirit was active in him. So then, what spoke, in relation to the utterance of sound, was a human being, but the force of what was said was something great and distinctive.

⁸⁴ See note 79 above on “construction.”

⁸⁵ See note 79 above on “construction.”

⁸⁶ Reading *bosōn* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr’s *boson*.

Fragment 25

From Section 60

(Translated from Syriac)

When we speak [about him] as about God the Creator of all and as same-in-substance with the Father,⁸⁷ who is glorified with him according to natural affinity, we signify the nature of the Word. But when [we speak] about him as limited, as one who exists now beyond the heaven and is coming here at the end for a terrible transformation, then we signify the human being, who in union with [the Word] receives honor from all. He was indeed worthy of all this praise and is coming as judge of the whole world.

Fragment 26

From Book 7

(Translated from Latin)

Now the union of the person can be recognized because he accomplished all things through him – this union happened by the indwelling that is according to good pleasure. Thus, when we say that the Son of God will come as judge, we understand it to be a coming from heaven of both the human being and God the Word simultaneously – not because God the Word is conveyed according to nature like the human being, but because he is united with him in every way by his good pleasure, wherever he is, because he accomplished all things through him.

Fragment 27

From Book 8

(Translated from Greek)

“The glory that you have given me I have given them.”⁸⁸ What kind [of glory] is this? Participation in adopted sonship. For he received this according to his humanity, first of all when he was baptized in the Jordan, where our baptism was prefigured in him. And the Father’s voice testified to the rebirth taking place [there] when he said, “This is my beloved Son, with whom I am

87 Literally, “as a child of the Father’s nature,” which is one of the regular Syriac translations of *homoousios*.

88 John 17:22.

well pleased.”⁸⁹ Once the Spirit descended, it remained upon him, just as we too would participate in this⁹⁰ in baptism. But this very thing came to him in an exceptional manner in comparison with us, since he participated in what the Son has by nature through his union with God the Word.

Fragment 28

From an Unknown Book or Section⁹¹

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> is greater than these. Along with that which indwells, the manner of indwelling is also known. It would be good for them to know that just because the term “indwelling” is common, it does not also indicate the specific manner of indwelling. Not in this instance alone do we find this to be the case. Rather, there are many things that have common names, and their specific features are known to be different. For even though the human being shares the name “living being” with the donkey, the bull, the sheep, the lion, the wolf, and the reptile, it is not the case that it actually participates with them.⁹² It appears with its own distinctive features, but the principle of the distinctive features of each of them is yet still preserved. For these have “being” and “irrational” in common, but each is separated from its neighbor in terms of the distinctive features that each of them has.

Why are these minor examples necessary for strengthening our argument, when we have a major example for the refutation of their ignorance? For they think that it is certainly possible to know what similarity everything has by means of that which is common to everything – namely, the [phrase] “it is,” which is common to God and to everything that exists. We say that God “is,” and we say everything that exists “is,” but we are not going to enumerate each one of them. Nor because God “is” are we saying that others are not. And it is not in the fact that we say “they are” as he is⁹³ <...>

89 Matt 3:17. The Greek verb *eudokē sa*, “I am well pleased,” is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

90 That is, the Spirit.

91 Though Fragments 28 and 29 have no internal indications of their original location, their contents indicate that they should be placed before Fragment 30, the ending of which indicates a recently completed discussion of the suitability of the concepts of “indwelling” and “mixture” – the subject of these two fragments.

92 That is, is simply an animal like them in all respects.

93 The lacunose nature of this fragment makes the point of this sentence unclear, though it is probably something like: “And even so [i.e. even though we say that they are], we do not say they are as he is.”

If something has a name in common with another, [that name] does not signify its distinctive features. Instead, the opposite: many things are distinct from one another in terms of nature and rank. And they are distinguished in the same way that allows a distinction between God and his creation; there is no distinction that is greater than this. They are together under a common word, but we learn their precise glory from their distinctive features. So it is too with the word “indwelling”: it is common, but each one has its own manner of indwelling; it is not the name “indwelling” that reveals equality but the species that reveals equality. The opposite is also found in questions regarding words. For when they are distinguished according to the expression “indwelling,” a simple word <...>

<...> teaches us. For our Lord commanded that when we fast, we should wash [our] faces and anoint [our] heads,⁹⁴ and to the one about to pray, he said, “Go inside and pray by yourself.”⁹⁵ And we do not see that this was taught at all by those who came before, neither to those who fasted nor to those who prayed. If this had been the custom among those who prayed, the assembly of the church would be superfluous. Furthermore, our praying all together in a group would invalidate the command “to go into your inner chamber and pray,”⁹⁶ and the command that a person should anoint his head when he fasts⁹⁷ contradicts the command, “Take nothing.”⁹⁸ For where did he get the oil from, if <...>

Fragment 29

From an Unknown Book or Section⁹⁹

(Translated from Syriac)

Now it is impossible for these natures to come to be in opposition to one another in this way. So the Lord caused the natures to be separate from one another, placing fire above in the heights and the earth below, and he enclosed the waters with sand acting like a city wall. And he separated them from each other, ordering that “the waters be gathered together into one place,”¹⁰⁰ so that the water would not mingle with the nature of earth. For [if they were mingled] they would be annulled and their natures would be obliterated by their contact in this [mixture]. [The waters] could not

94 See Matt 6:17. 95 See Matt 6:6. 96 See Matt 6:6. 97 See Matt 6:17.

98 Luke 9:3, “Take nothing for your journey, no staff, nor bag, nor bread, nor money; and do not have two tunics.”

99 See note 91 above. 100 Gen 1:9.

be received into the earth and would overrun it, since [the earth's] density would be depleted. And since [the waters] are stronger than fire, they would consume its nature, but earth would not conquer the fire in such a way that it carries it within itself <...> the earth and to allow it to germinate fruits. If the heat is strong, fruits will fail even more than dry sticks. Fruits wither from [both] hot and cold winds, since each of them has this activity, but the moisture of the winds easily rots them. Thus too if seeds are immersed in [too] much water, they fail in the ground. But if great heat is added to them, germination [happens too] rapidly, and their utility brings no benefit to the farmer, since the plant is incapable of being established in the depth, as something that rightly participates in the earth, so that it may be fixed in it. And if the cold is harsh, the generation of the seeds falters and fails. Thus, then, it is impossible for these natures to oppose one another. Previously <...>

Thus we say that heat is mixed with cold, or water with wine, and often we say that air is "mixed." When coolness is joined to heat, it mixes and the mixture becomes balanced. No one would say oil mixes with oil, or water with water, or dryness, or heat, or cold on the grounds that their activities result in different effects. So this word – "mixture" – is employed rightly. We even find that the divine scripture uses "mixture." For the blessed David said, "There is a cup in the Lord's hand, and it is full of mixed, turbid wine."¹⁰¹ In other words, it is mixed. The wise Solomon said, "Wisdom built herself a house; she has slaughtered her sacrifice; she has mixed her vessels of her wine."¹⁰² In these passages we find the word "mixture" in the scriptures.

We also use it. For how often do we use "mixture" in reference to a human being? That which has come to be from the commixture of the four elements is what constitutes the body. It is not that the earth that is in it is visible as earth, nor that the air that is known to be in it can be dissipated, nor that the water [that is in it] can flow. But when the activity of these elements [is] mixed, the constitution of the body is accomplished for us. For the effect of their activities is mixed – that is, the heat and the cold and the dryness and the moisture, according to the wisdom of their mixer. They are established for the protection of the body. And we say that the offspring of every species are established in the same way too, but these natures of

¹⁰¹ Ps 74(75):9.

¹⁰² Prov 9:1–2, with omissions.

fire and earth and air and water are not mixed. If this did not occur, the elements would disappear from them every time – [those very elements] which from part of their natures received constitution. Therefore, it is impossible for these natures to be opposed to one another because their activities are in opposition to one another. But if they are in a commixture, the result would be that they disappear <...>

Fragment 30

From Book 8, Section 62 and Book 9, Section 63

(*Translated from Syriac and Greek*)¹⁰³

Angels said to the disciples of the one who was taken up to heaven, “Galilean men, why are you standing there and gazing at heaven? This Jesus, who was taken from you up to heaven, will come in the same way that you saw him ascend to heaven.”¹⁰⁴

Greek¹⁰⁵

In every way, then, it is clear that the concept of “mixing” is terribly inappropriate and unsuitable since each of the natures remains by itself without dissolution. But it is perfectly clear that the concept of “union” is fitting, for through it, the natures are brought together to constitute one person according to the union. Accordingly, what the Lord said in reference to the man and woman – “so they are no longer two but one flesh”¹⁰⁶ – we too might also plausibly say in virtue of the principle of the union: “so they are no longer two persons but one,” of course, as long as the natures are distinguished. For just as in the former case calling them “one flesh” does not do away with their being two

Syriac

Now from all these things it is very clear that the doctrine of mixture is superfluous, neither useful nor fitting. Rather, there is a union in which the natures remain undissolved. In this [union], the natures are joined and made one person, just as our Lord said regarding husband and wife, “so they are no longer two, but one flesh.”¹⁰⁷ We have said the same thing about the doctrine of the union, that they are no longer two but one. It is clear that, though the natures are different, just as their being said to be one flesh is not at all marred by the number two – for how they are said [to be one flesh] is clear – so also here the union of the person is not corrupted by the difference between the natures. When we

¹⁰³ The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 10. Where the original Greek is extant, it is placed to the left of the Syriac. Another fragment preserves a different Syriac translation of the same material; this parallel appears in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

¹⁰⁴ Acts 1:11. ¹⁰⁵ This is the Greek of LT6. ¹⁰⁶ Matt 19:6.

¹⁰⁷ Matt 19:6. See Origen’s similar Christological use of this same verse in *On First Principles* 2.6, translated in this volume on p. 192.

Greek

in number – for it is perfectly clear in what respect they are called “one” – so too in the latter case the union of the person does not do away with the distinctiveness of the natures. For when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of God the Word is complete and his person is complete (for it’s impossible to speak of a hypostasis without a person), and moreover that the nature of the human being is complete and his person likewise. But when we turn our attention to the conjunction, then we say there is one person.

Syriac

consider the natures, we perceive the divine nature in its hypostasis and the human nature. When we observe the conjunction, we say one person and one hypostasis.

Syriac¹⁰⁸

Also in the case of the human being: when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of the soul is one thing, and that of the body another – a single hypostasis of the one and a single [hypostasis] of the other. Thus we know they are different, namely, when the soul is distant from the body, it is its own dwelling¹⁰⁹ and exists in its own person. Therefore, each one of them is spoken of in its own person, in accordance with the doctrine of the nature. In fact, this is also the case with “the inner human being” and “the outer human being,” as designated by Paul: each one is worthy of the name of the common whole. It is obvious, though, that with the addition of the “inner” and the “outer,” he does not understand the whole together by a loose phrase or by a diminution of the name, inasmuch as he joins that which is said to the two of them together.¹¹⁰

Syriac

For just as when we distinguish the nature of the human being, we say the nature of the soul is one thing and that of the body another, recognizing that each of them has a hypostasis and nature, and just as we are convinced that, when the soul is separated from the body, it abides in its nature and in its hypostasis and each of them has a nature and hypostasis, so also do we learn from the Apostle that the same [applies] to the inner human being and the outer human being. We name their oneness by something common [to both], then add “inner” and “outer,” so as not to name them simply with a phrase. For as we say about them that they are conjoined in one hypostasis and one person, we designate the two in one.

108 This is the Syriac of BT 17b. 109 Literally, “place.”

110 That is, when one specifies “inner” or “outer,” one seems to limit the thing being referred to, but Theodore wants to make the point that having a phrase like “the inner human being” does not void the larger category “human being.”

Greek¹¹¹

In the same way also in this case, we say that the substance of God the Word is his own and that of the human being is his own. For the natures are distinguished, but one person is constituted by the union. Thus, in this case, when we attempt to distinguish the natures, we say that the person of the human being is complete and that of the divinity is complete, but when we focus our attention on the union, we proclaim that both the natures conjointly are one person, with the humanity receiving honor from [all] creation by the divinity and the divinity accomplishing all that is right in the humanity.

Syriac

In the same way also in this case we say that there is a divine nature and a human nature. And while we recognize the natures, there is one person of the union. And thus, when we wish to perceive the natures, we say that the human being is complete in his hypostasis. We also say that the divinity is complete. For what unity do we wish to perceive? We proclaim one person and one hypostasis for the two natures. As we know, humanity receives honor from creation because of the union with divinity and divinity performs all things in it.

The Beginning of Book Nine¹¹²

63. How the heretics use “the Word became flesh”¹¹³ against us.¹¹⁴

64. How the heretics use “he took the form of a slave”¹¹⁵ against us.

65. That it is impossible, according to the doctrine of the heretics, for God the Word with a human body to be called a human being.

Book Nine

In what we have already said, we have shown the might and magnitude of the church’s teaching. We sufficiently demonstrated from the words of scripture we previously rehearsed that “indwelling” is fittingly said, and we demonstrated from the scriptures that we rightly employ the word “union” and abstain from the word “mixture.” Although we have already addressed our position on these things well, we should not allow whatever they put forward to abolish the two of them.¹¹⁶

They say they have two firm witnesses that suffice to establish their novel fables. Here they are: from the evangelist, “the Word became flesh,”¹¹⁷ and from the Apostle, “he emptied himself and took the form of a slave.”¹¹⁸ Oh, what an abundance of folly! How do they not realize that what seems

111 This is the Greek of LT7.

112 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

113 John 1:14. 114 Book 9 begins with a list of the sections it contains.

115 Phil 2:7. 116 That is, the words “indwelling” and “union.”

117 John 1:14. 118 Phil 2:7.

agreeable to them, which they often repeat, actually opposes them? How can “became flesh” be similar to “he took the form of a slave”? For that’s how these passages would have to be understood according to their opinion. It is clear that something that is “becoming” is not anything else alongside what it “became” but it is whatever it is said to be “becoming,” since it is known that that which is “becoming” in the hypostasis has “become.” But the one that takes is said to be something else beyond what it takes, just as God in this way fashioned the body from <...>

Fragment 31

From an Unknown Book or Section¹¹⁹

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> himself. “Look, I have *become* a fool, because you have forced me [to it].”¹²⁰ It is not we who say that the Apostle was a fool, but this was said by him because of the boasting of those who are ignorant of the purpose of boasting. He did not say it so that he might engage in boasting himself, but in order to abolish boasters.

On the topic of Christ, [he said], “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by *becoming* a curse for us, as [is written], ‘Cursed is he who by decree of the law is hung on the tree.’”¹²¹ Since he accepted that he would be hung on a tree, our Lord is said to have become a curse – not as if he is changed into a curse, but [that he is changed] in the estimation of others. For the Apostle said, “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law and *became* a curse for us,” and after that, he quotes, “It is written that ‘cursed is everyone that is hung from a tree.’” Thus he was a “curse” in the estimation of others because he accepted the punishment which the law stipulated for debtors – death – so that by [doing so] he might dissolve the curses upon us. He was estimated as a curse by those who failed to grasp the greatness of the [divine] economy and by the sinful Jews.

119 Though Fragment 31 has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – a discussion of the word “became” from John 1:14 – indicate that it should be placed after Fragment 30, which introduces the discussion of John 1:14, and before Fragment 32, which sums up a previous discussion of John 1:14.

120 2 Cor 12:11. In this fragment, Theodore discusses several scriptural passages which in Greek contain some form of the verb *ginomai*, which appears in John 1:14 as *egeneto* (“became”). Here the forms of this verb are italicized for clarity, even if they cannot always be translated with some form of “become.”

121 Gal 3:13, quoting Deut 21:23.

According to the meaning¹²² which is in the passage where Joshua the son of Nun says to his warriors, “Look, you will surround the city, and do not *be* very far from the city”¹²³ – for they were not surrounding it¹²⁴ and were very far from it – it is in this sense, then, that the Apostle said about our Lord, that “he *came to be* in the likeness of a human being.”¹²⁵ For it was in the meaning when it was said that “he dwelled with the saints,” as if [to say] “he was among them in love” and he was not very far [from them] in nature.

[“Became” is also used] in reference to the receiving of children, as when it says, “Abraham was one hundred years old when Isaac *became* his son.”¹²⁶ It is used in reference to the acquisition of wealth, as when it is said about Isaac, that “there *came* to him bulls and sheep and many workers.”¹²⁷ It is used in reference to equality in honor, as in what was said about him, “The Lord blessed him, and the man grew rich and he continued to become strong until he *became* very great.”¹²⁸ And it is used in reference to health, as when it said that “it *became* a corrupter of the flesh.”¹²⁹

So then, this [word], “became,” has been used in many ways in the scriptures. It is also used in many ways according to our customary way of speaking. At times it is used in reference to activities, at times in reference to passive experiences. It is used in reference to changes in activity and in ways of thinking. And even now it is used as something thought by those who do not adhere to the truth of the literal [interpretation], as a [signal] for meaning. It is said in reference to the assumption <...> or in reference to the acquisition <...> or <...>.

It is also said in reference to the hypostasis, and thus many come to an accurate understanding of it. For by “hypostasis” is implied the two persons, whether they are as they were from the beginning or as [they have been] changed into other things. [It is used] in reference to activity, as when it is said, “The Lord *became* my helper and place of refuge and my salvation.”¹³⁰ And in another place, “The Lord *became* for me a place of refuge and my God a helper”¹³¹ – God has become a helper and Savior, not by changing, but by pitying and helping. This is something literal. Thus also in the Acts of the Apostles the blessed Peter said, “Men and brothers, it was fitting

122 Alternatively, “the understanding.” 123 Josh 8:4.

124 Literally, “they were at a distance [from it].” 125 Phil 2:7.

126 Gen 21:5. 127 Gen 26:14. 128 Gen 26:12–13.

129 Citation unknown. 130 Ps 7:2. 131 Ps 93(94):22.

that the scripture be fulfilled, which the Spirit spoke beforehand through the mouth of David about Judas, who *became* the guide of those traitors.”¹³² This is said literally because he literally became a leader.

“Became” is also said in reference to passive experiences, “I have *become* like a deaf man in whose mouth there is no admonition.”¹³³ And also, “I have *become* a byword to them.”¹³⁴ It is not that there was an actual change into a deaf person but that as a result of much adversity he now became like one who was deaf. Thus, because of the many adversities of his passion it is said that he was like a deaf man.

[“Became” is also said] in reference to a change in activity or in ways of thinking, as when it says about the Messiah that “he *came to be* under the law so that he might redeem those who were under the law.”¹³⁵ It is said that “he *came to be* under the law” because it dictated his conduct, and he fulfilled everything in his life on its behalf. And again, “*Become* imitators of me.”¹³⁶ And it is clear that this also refers to a change in lifestyle, as is thought by many in accordance with the non-literal interpretation. As for what he says about <...>

Fragment 32

From Book 9

(Translated from Greek)

In these circumstances, then,¹³⁷ we have found that “he became” cannot have been said in any other way than in the sense of “he appeared.” In our statements above we taught that it is quite precisely this very thing that is said in the divine scripture and by others especially in regard to the Lord. For “the Word became flesh”¹³⁸ [means] he appeared, but appeared not in the sense that he did not take real flesh but in the sense that he did not become [real flesh]. For when he¹³⁹ says, “he took,”¹⁴⁰ he says it not in the sense that he [only] appeared [to take flesh] but in the sense that he really [took flesh]. But when [he¹⁴¹ says] “he became,” then [he says it] in the sense that “he appeared.” For he was not changed into flesh. So then, one must

132 Acts 1:16. 133 Ps 37(38):14. 134 Ps 68(69):12. 135 1 Cor 9:20.

136 1 Cor 11:1.

137 Reading *toinun* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *toinēn*.

138 John 1:14. 139 That is, Paul. 140 Phil 2:7.

141 That is, the author of the Gospel of John.

attend to the evangelist's meaning, for in this way shall we understand the meaning of his words.

Fragment 33

From Book 9

(Translated from Latin)

In any case, if the statement, "The Word became flesh," is said in a way indicating some alteration, how ought "he indwelt"¹⁴² be understood? For it is obvious to everyone that what indwells is different from what is indwelt. For "he indwelt among us" when he assumed our nature and dwelt [in it] and arranged in it all things for our salvation. Therefore, how did the Word of God become flesh by indwelling? It is obvious that he was neither altered nor transformed, for then he could not be said to indwell.

Fragment 34

From Book 9

(Translated from Greek)

For what is said in our case in relation to our spatial disposition [is said] in God's case in relation to the disposition of his will.¹⁴³ After all, just as in our case we say, "I came to be in this place," so too in God's case [we say], "He came to be in this [place]." For what movement enacts in our case, willing does in God's case, since by nature he is present everywhere.

Fragment 35

From Section 66

(Translated from Syriac)

So, both from the testimonies they advanced and from the things said afterward, it is demonstrated that the human being, God the Word enfleshed, cannot be honored except if the human being is a living thing like this <...>

142 John 1:14. The verb in Latin is *inhabitavit*, which is normally translated, "he dwelt." But in order to bring out Theodore's point, a translation that highlights the *in* prefix is needed.

143 In Greek *kata tēn [schēsin] tēs gnōmēs*, which in the Latin of Fragment 69 is translated *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

Fragment 36

From Section 66

(Translated from Syriac)

Therefore, they are guilty on every count of talking very foolishly, since God the Word enfleshed is not known by the title of “human being.” Obviously, when scripture mentions the title “human being” with respect to Christ, it always indicates the nature of the human being, which was assumed complete by him for our salvation. It is that one which scripture customarily calls by this title.

Fragment 37

From Book 10, Section 70

(Translated from Latin)

For just as we are taught the difference between natures by such words from the divine scripture, so too we declare the union as often as [scripture] combines the properties of both natures into one thing and so speaks of one particular thing. For this is to show both the different natures and the union of the person simultaneously: from the difference between the things said, the difference between natures is understood, but when they are connected in one thing, we recognize the clear union. And so, the blessed evangelist John said, “The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him and said, ‘Behold, the Lamb of God! Behold, the one who takes away the sins of the world. This is the one of whom I said, “After me comes a man who ranks before me, because he was before me and I did not know him.”’”¹⁴⁴ For in saying this – “He saw Jesus coming toward him and said, ‘Behold, the Lamb of God!’” – it seems to me that he clearly signifies the humanity. For that which John the Baptist saw was that which underwent death, namely, the body that was offered for the whole world. But what follows – “the one who takes away the sins of the world” – is surely not in any way applicable to the flesh. For it was not the work of the flesh to take away the sin of the whole world, but this was unquestionably the work of the divinity.

¹⁴⁴ John 1:29–30.

Fragment 38

From Book 10

(Translated from Greek)

“Then an angel from heaven appeared to him, giving him strength. And being in agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like drops of blood falling down upon the ground.”¹⁴⁵ We learn from these words, then, that Christ clearly endured the agony and no ordinary one at that.

Fragment 39

From Book 10

(Translated from Greek)

What sort of coherence is there between the phrases “the one who descended from heaven” and “the one who is in heaven”?¹⁴⁶ For the one eliminates the other: “descending from heaven” by “being in heaven” and “being” by “descending.” But he “descended” by indwelling in the human being, whereas he “is in heaven” by being present to all through the limitlessness of his nature.

Fragment 40

From an Unknown Book or Section¹⁴⁷

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> that are said. As the Apostle also said, “We speak the wisdom of God in secret, that which was hidden, which God first set apart before the foundations of the world for our glory. None of the rulers of this world knew it, for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, ‘no eye had seen, nor ear heard, nor had it arisen in a human heart what God has prepared for those who love him.’”¹⁴⁸ This glory in the human being, which is superior to and has surpassed the entire human nature, was revealed to them. They did not acquire accurate

¹⁴⁵ Luke 22:43–44.

¹⁴⁶ John 3:13.

¹⁴⁷ Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – an interpretation of Ps 8:1–3 – indicate that it is connected with Fragment 41, which interprets Ps 8:5–7 and should be placed before it.

¹⁴⁸ 1 Cor 2:7–9.

knowledge of him, something that we see even the apostles acquired at the end. It was important at that time that thenceforth the nature of the human being be revealed – but it was not possible for it to come forth, because of the profundity of the things that were spoken of among others. He recalled the greatness of glory; he was at that time silent about those things that were superior to the nature. And he rehearsed while speaking humbly about him, “You have made him a little lower than [the angels]”¹⁴⁹ <...> so that those, insofar as they were able, might at that time receive what was said, but those who came afterwards, after advancing to the limit of things that pertain to knowledge, would receive the truth from the miracles that were performed at that time and from the testimonies that were spoken beforehand, since these last activities would give them accurate knowledge.

But why am I saying these things when it is easy for us to make our demonstrations from scripture as we promised? The sense of the psalm is clear to everyone: it is right for us to reflect on its first words in reference to the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, namely, “Lord, our Lord, how glorious is your name in all the earth?,” and, “Your glory is higher than the heavens,” and, “From the mouth of the child you have established your glory,” and, “I see your heavens, the work of your hands,” and, “the moon and the stars which you established.”¹⁵⁰ And it is clear that we learn from our Lord [as well], as the book of blessed Matthew the evangelist has transmitted to us. For it narrated how in accordance with the word of prophecy the Lord sat upon the ass¹⁵¹ and entered the city, and how <...>

Fragment 41

From Book 10

(Translated from Latin and Greek)

“What¹⁵² is the human being that you keep him in mind, or the Son of Man that you visit him?”¹⁵³ So¹⁵⁴ let us investigate who the human being is about whom the prophet is amazed and astonished, that the Only-Begotten

149 Ps 8:6; Heb 2:7. 150 Ps 8:1–3.

151 Matt 21:5, alluding to Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9.

152 The translation begins with the Latin. 153 Ps 8:5.

154 The translation switches to the Greek here.

should deign to keep him in mind and make a visitation. But that this is not said <about every human being> has been shown in the remarks above. That it is not about just one random individual – this too is quite clear. So let us put aside everything, let us accept the apostolic testimony, which is most trustworthy of all. For¹⁵⁵ when the Apostle writes to the Hebrews, he tells them about Christ and confirms his person, which was not acceptable to them, saying, “It has been testified somewhere, ‘What is the human being that you keep him in mind, or the Son of Man that you visit him? You have made him a little less than the angels; with glory and honor you have crowned him and set him over the works of your hands; you have subjected all things under his feet.’”¹⁵⁶ And after quoting this testimony he added an interpretation of it, “Now by putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing that was not subjected. But now we do not yet see everything subjected to him.”¹⁵⁷ And then he teaches us who the human being is, since doubt was voiced about this by the blessed David, adding, “But we see Jesus made a little less than the angels, crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death.”¹⁵⁸ Therefore, if we have learned from the gospels that it was in reference to the Lord that the blessed David spoke everything in this psalm – “you keep in mind” and “you visit” and “you have made less” and “you have subjected” and the rest – and if we are taught by the Apostle that it is Jesus of whom David was speaking when he said that he kept him in mind and visited him, and also that he subjected everything to him, when he made him a little less than the angels, then it is high time to put aside your shamelessness, even if it is difficult, in full awareness of what is proper. For you see, you who are most wicked of all human beings, how great the difference between the natures is, because there was amazement over [the Only-Begotten] deigning to keep the human being in mind, to visit him, and to make him share in the rest of the things in which he made him share, while on the contrary there was astonishment over [the human being] meriting to share in such great things surpassing his nature. The former is marveled at because he gives a promotion and bestows great things that surpass the nature of one who obtained the promotion, whereas the other is marveled at because he obtains the promotion and receives from him things that are greater than he deserves.

155 The translation returns to the Latin here.

156 Heb 2:6–8, quoting Ps 8:5–7.

157 Heb 2:8. 158 Heb 2:9.

Fragment 42
From Books 10 and 11
(*Translated from Syriac*)

And some things are applied to the two – some chrysolite and some fire. From Isaiah, “garments worn” and “reddened by the blood of [our] enemies.”¹⁵⁹ And it is at another point, when he is in a human body and sitting on the throne, that he is surrounded by seraphim.¹⁶⁰ Forced, then, by such sights we might go as far as to think that they did not have human bodies, but rather were novel [bodies] created by uncommon means, since they have wings and feathers on the wings. And we say that the body that was assumed by God the Father is one thing, that assumed by the Son is another, and both are different and separate from the angels, because in fact, to Balaam he appeared as a human being, a sword clasped in his hand,¹⁶¹ and to Joshua he appeared in the form of someone armed.¹⁶² Lest we put forward too many words about these things, let us just say, “many bodies,” if we are led along by such visions to think they are accurate. But if this is not possible (that these visions appear for the sake of their utility, to aid those who see them), it is clear that even Abraham received a vision that appeared to him suitably from God <...>

*The End of Book Ten.*¹⁶³

The Sections of Book Eleven

Those who ask, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one who conferred a benefit or the one who received a benefit?”

Those who say, “It is obvious that our Lord [does] not [have] a soul, and he comes to us in the mysteries [as] body and blood.”¹⁶⁴

<...>

<...> that the words he prepared

<...> that are said now

<...> the division of the natures, the union of the person; rightfully in these things

<...> said above.

We have employed sufficient proofs about the soul and the mind to confirm the truth of the required things. Here, we seek to demonstrate

159 Isa 63:1. 160 Isa 6:1–3. 161 Num 22:23. 162 Josh 5:13.

163 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

164 The remainder of the section titles are quite fragmentary.

this alone, but we will also demonstrate something more: that we learn from the scriptures not merely the difference between the natures, but also the sign of the body and the rational soul, from which it is manifest that he is a complete human being. As a consequence, let us grasp on to what the orderly arrangement of the doctrine demands. These people raise many different questions to us to [try to] nullify the truth. Sometimes they say, "If we say [there are] two complete, then we must say two sons." And at other times, "It is not right to say one and the other." And also, "It is right to say that God the Word was crucified, for he is the Messiah and not something else." We have fittingly responded to such questions and promised to make known the truth of the church by an exposition. Because we did not lie with our promise, we have replied to the question in full, and we are compelled to do so with the words spoken in the accurate testimonies. First of all <...>

Fragment 43
From Book 11, Section 73
(*Translated from Syriac*)¹⁶⁵

Did he assume, or was he assumed? Is he the form of God or the form of the human being? Do you not say it was the form of God that assumed, but the form of the slave that was assumed? Why do you need the artifice of asking questions now, and why don't you draw their distinction from the divine scriptures and impress knowledge of the fear of God on your pure minds? In what way is he who assumed similar to that which was assumed? Or what equality is there between God and the human being? Or between the slave and the Lord? Between the form of God and the form of the slave? See how greatly he has demonstrated to us the distinction between the natures, calling the one "the form of the slave" and the other "[the form] of God,"¹⁶⁶ the one who assumed and the one who was assumed. He put these distinctions together in one place and made us understand the union of the person. For he said, "Rather, he emptied himself and took the form of a slave, and came to be in the likeness of human beings."¹⁶⁷

165 The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 12–13. Two fragments preserve a different Syriac translation of the same material; these parallels appear in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

166 See Phil 2:6–7. 167 Phil 2:7.

And after mentioning his corporeality,¹⁶⁸ he turned toward the humanity, making known by his revelation its conjunction with God the Word. For he says, “He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross.”¹⁶⁹ And clearly these things correspond to the nature of the human being, who was fastened with nails to the cross and accepted death according to his nature. What indicates the conjunction was the fact that he “humbled himself,” not that he was human when he accepted death for himself. He who endured the decree of God upon his nature from the beginning¹⁷⁰ “humbled himself and became obedient unto death, and all the more [death] on a cross.”¹⁷¹ This is the one who was assumed by God the Word. And he became capable of overcoming death because of his conjunction. By his will, on behalf of our salvation, he endured suffering and he continued to speak things that are fitting and appropriate for human nature. In connection with these things, he said, “Because of this God highly exalted him and gave him the name above every name.”¹⁷² And what do we say was exalted? God the Word? If so, how did the one who was the form of God, the likeness of God, accept being taken up to the heights? For it is not possible that this was a kind of “participation” by theft; rather, it must be something that was appropriate to his nature, even though he knew full well that he was equal with his Father, and even though he was well pleased in his will that his glory be hidden and that he appear in the form of a slave for our salvation. This is what Paul said about him; is there anything greater than what has been said? He accepted [death] and was exalted. Otherwise, how did God elevate one who was equal to himself – or indeed one who made himself greater than God? It is vile to say this, but it is required if they are equal. When one remains within [a certain] measure, but the other is elevated beyond that measure of equality, then equality goes away. In this case, then, it is clear that he would be great [and] would have had actual equality from the start. And how, among these equals, is one able to give grace and the other to need it? And what [could be] given to him? In fact, we also see this: it says “the name.” And what is that [name]? “At the name of Jesus, every knee will bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God his Father.”¹⁷³ And [on their view] the Maker of

168 Presumably a reference to verse just quoted, Phil 2:7. 169 Phil 2:8.

170 A reference to punishment given to Adam and Eve in Gen 3.

171 Phil 2:8. 172 Phil 2:9. 173 Phil 2:10.

all received this grace [of the name] after death, even though by his hand everything was created and without him nothing of what exists would have even been established.¹⁷⁴

For if someone says that this [name] was granted to him, that is, to God the Word, as many have wickedly said, they have turned to something other than knowledge of the truth and worshiped it. And [if this is true] it is clear that even the Father received this grace [of the name]. There were many who spoke wickedly in this way, but after the coming of Christ they turned to knowledge. However, according to their doctrine, it is right to say precisely the Father received the grace [of the name] all the more. For he who in the coming and in his suffering made it so that every person might be brought to knowledge of the Father, namely

Syriac¹⁷⁵

Now, our Lord himself said, “I have made your name known to humanity.”¹⁷⁶ It is obvious, then, that he said these [words] about the one who was assumed, the one who was glorified by all creation and [received] the confession of [his] lordship and veneration from all, “from those in heaven, those on earth, and those under the entire earth.”¹⁷⁷ For this is the grace that the one who was assumed has taken up.

Syriac

our Lord, said to his Father, “I will make your name known among human beings.”¹⁷⁸ It is clear then that these things were said about the one who was assumed, the one to whom glory was given from all creation, and the confession of [his] lordship and worship “from all in heaven and earth and under the earth.”¹⁷⁹ It was he who was assumed that assumed this grace, not while he was simple and by himself but in union with God the Word.

For every glory is owed to the only-begotten God the Word from his creation, because all came into being through him. Those who offer worship to this one, even though they know that the form of the slave who was assumed is one with him, when they give glory also worship the form of the slave that was assumed, being aware of the union of the form of the slave with God the Word. So if anyone wants to say “God” about God the Word as the one who exalted him, it seems to me that he has spoken well. And this understanding is fitting also for the doctrine of the Word. For he assumed the form of a slave and in his union with him he exalted and elevated him, and allowed him to be worshiped by all creation. So then, where do we go

174 See John 1:3. 175 This is the Syriac of BT20. 176 John 17:6.
177 Phil 2:10. 178 John 17:6. 179 Phil 2:10.

from here? Did he assume, or was he assumed? Is he the form of God or the form of a slave? Is he the Maker of all, or has he received worship by grace? May every blaspheming tongue be silent! Let the blessed Apostle teach us, clearly, what the distinction between the natures is, and what the glory of the nature that assumed is, and whether he is the one who was assumed, and whether this one is the form of God and that one is the form of a slave, and how he allowed himself in his mercy to be brought down from his glory. By grace he was assumed by him and by grace he is worshiped by all creation.

And [the Apostle] adds to those things while teaching us about the union. He teaches this by gathering [the phrases] together in one place. For while he spoke about God the Word, [saying] that “he who was in the form of God”¹⁸⁰ and the rest, and that “he came to be in the likeness of human beings and was found in the form of the human being,”¹⁸¹ he also added that “he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross”¹⁸² – which was a demonstration of humanity. He also said, “because of this God exalted him,”¹⁸³ and all those things that he thereafter also said about him. It appears that they were opposed, but I am amazed at the accuracy of the words of the Apostle, that first he said about him that he assumed and then about the other that he was assumed. He called the former the form of God and the latter the form of the slave. And after he distinguished the natures accurately, then he mentioned also his corporeality and death on a cross, and also the things that happened to him after death – namely, the glory he received from all creation – and in all these things he makes the union apparent. For in that assumption [there was] that which assumed and that which was assumed. And by the fact that the former was the form of God and the latter the form of the slave we distinguish the natures, but we understand the union of the person by the glory that makes God the Word participate in death and in the cross. But they do not want to give any heed to the things that were said, and they scorn learning the truth from the scriptures,

Syriac¹⁸⁴

So sometimes they ask, “Is he one thing and another thing, or is he one and the same?” and sometimes, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved, the one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?”

Syriac

so they sometimes ask, “Is he one thing and another thing? Or is he [one and] the same?” And also, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? Is he the one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?”

180 Phil 2:6. 181 Phil 2:7. 182 Phil 2:8. 183 Phil 2:9.

184 This is the Syriac of BT 21.

Latin

What we have said in regard to such [questions] is indeed sufficient, where we showed both the difference between the natures and the union of the person, and that with respect to the natures, this one received a benefit, but the other conferred a benefit, since there is a firm union that results in honor being paid inseparably by the whole creation.

Syriac¹⁸⁵

What we have already said about such questions is sufficient: we showed both the difference between the natures and the union of the person. And with respect to the natures, this one received a benefit, but the other was found to confer a benefit, since there is an obvious union that results in honor [being paid] inseparably from all completed creation.

Syriac

For these things that have been said are sufficient, in which we showed the difference between the natures and the union of the person. And it is manifest in terms of nature that the one received a benefit and the other conferred a benefit, since there is an obvious union of the two of them that results in worship being received from the whole creation.

Let us demonstrate this even more accurately from the words of the blessed David. For Paul witnesses to those things that were said or were explained by him and which were taken up by our Lord and by the apostles. In fact, they are from the Lord since he is the one who was speaking in the Apostle. The blessed David saw first in the grace of the Holy Spirit the whole economy that was going to happen, that God the Creator of all would be willing to dwell in a human being for our salvation, and to assume the form of a slave, and to make it one with him and let [this form] rule in union with him over all. He wondered at his mercy and was amazed by the magnitude of the glory of human beings, that [God] made us worthy of this glory, so that he might dwell in our nature. He knew this beforehand by the revelation of the Spirit, so that all people might be aware of God the Creator of all, and that in creation his name might be praised and everyone might know his Maker, who was not known to them before. He marveled about these two as one: first, about the fact that [God] would turn those inclined to evil to the good, and second, that he would perform this activity in a human being as if in a vessel, which he assumed as though the first from our race, and he prepared everything in him for the salvation of our lives, and that there be subjected to him <...>

185 This is the Syriac of BT21.

Fragment 44
From an Unknown Book or Section¹⁸⁶

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> that it might be useful for the distinction between the natures. They ask us, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?” And they continue on, putting this bitter and scheming question to those who are upright, having no care for what might be agreeable and suitable for the teachings of the church. Therefore, it is right to demonstrate these things from the divine scripture, even if it was already possible to demonstrate [them] from what was mentioned above. Different properties necessarily follow from different natures. When they want to inquire rationally into the natures, it is because of their stubborn disbelief; they ask unusual questions so as to propound novelties.

So let us add this: it is quite obvious that one conferred a benefit and the other received a benefit. We have already learned this from the gospel. For when our Lord came to Jerusalem and started to drive out from the temple those selling doves and sheep, he said to them, “This house is for prayer and not to be set up for business.”¹⁸⁷ And they asked him for a sign, that he might demonstrate his greatness and thereby confirm that he could order the long-held custom to be stopped. But he did not show them this sign. Instead, he said to them, “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up”¹⁸⁸ – in explanation of this the evangelist said, “He was talking about the temple of his body.”¹⁸⁹ They continue on and say to us (for it is lovely to use their own words against them), “Is he the one who raises or the one who is raised? Is he the one who raises the one who was destroyed, or is he the one who receives the destruction?” Now these in fact do not fit with one another. For the one who is destroyed needs the one who raises him, who is beyond suffering and by his authority raises the one who is destroyed. Tell us then! What is right to say regarding this question? But we respond very easily and say we have sufficient knowledge

¹⁸⁶ Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – a discussion of the questions, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?” – indicate that it is connected with the similar discussion in Fragment 43, and should be placed before Fragment 45, which sums up the discussion of these questions.

¹⁸⁷ See John 2:13–16. ¹⁸⁸ John 2:19. ¹⁸⁹ John 2:21.

of this from scripture. One is destroyed, the other raises. One is the temple that receives destruction; the other is the one who raises it, namely God the Word, who promised to raise his destroyed temple. How do they fail to learn the distinction between the natures from these things, and [arrive at] the knowledge of the truth? Instead they launch assaults with crafty questions to confuse the simple.

Fragment 45

From Section 73

(Translated from Syriac)

So as not to drag out the discussion too long, these topics – the natures and the subject of our demonstration, namely, that it is clearly shown from the divine scriptures that one confers a benefit and the other receives a benefit – have been covered sufficiently.

Fragment 46

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

And now because of this, we must move on from these matters. For it will be demonstrated, with God's assistance, that the human being who was assumed is something other in nature than God the Word, as has been shown to us by the things said explicitly.

Fragment 47

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

For this reason he did not say, "He has spoken to us in *the* Son," but "in a Son."¹⁹⁰ Since this is said without qualification, it can signify both by the same [wording]: it principally signifies the true Son (and by "true Son" I mean the one who acquired sonship through a natural begetting) and secondarily along with this it also allows in its meaning the one who truly participates in the dignity [of sonship] through his union with him.¹⁹¹

¹⁹⁰ Heb 1:2.

¹⁹¹ That is, with the true Son.

Fragment 48

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

At long last, then, will they end this shameful wrangling and abandon¹⁹² this pointless quarrel, respecting the obvious meaning of the words? For he says, “bringing many sons to glory.”¹⁹³ See, then, it is clear that the Apostle includes the assumed human being among the “many” in the category of sonship: he does not participate in sonship in a similar manner as them, but in a similar manner nonetheless, in that he received sonship by grace since divinity alone possesses natural sonship.¹⁹⁴ Now this much is perfectly clear, that the exceptional status of sonship is peculiar to him¹⁹⁵ in comparison to the rest of human beings, through his union with him.¹⁹⁶ Accordingly, he is conceptually understood to be included in the term “Son.” But they concoct the argument against us that if we speak of two complete things, we will surely also be speaking of two sons. But note that in scripture “son” is mentioned by itself, with no reference to the divinity, when he is being classified with the rest of human beings, and we do not actually speak of two sons. The Son is rightly confessed to be one, since the difference between the natures ought necessarily to remain and the union of the person be preserved indivisible. And when he says, “bringing many sons to glory,” he adds, “to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”¹⁹⁷ See how clearly he says that God the Word perfected the assumed human being “through sufferings,” whom he also called “the pioneer of salvation” because he was the first to be deemed worthy of this and became the cause [of this] for others.

192 Reading *apostēsontai* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *apostēsonta*.

193 Heb 2:10.

194 The insertions and omissions to this sentence suggested by Behr, Jansen, and Daley seem unnecessary, as sense can be made of the passage without them.

195 The Greek here is *tēs huiotētos autō ... prosesti to exaireton*. The ancient Latin translation of this fragment goes as follows: *filiationis gloria ... inest ei praecipue*. The difference is perhaps indicative of a corruption in the Greek as we have it. This led Jansen to conjecturally prefix <*hē doxa*> to these words. The Latin version translated would be: “Now this much is perfectly clear, that the glory of sonship is peculiar to him in an exceptional manner in comparison to the rest of human beings, through the union with him.”

196 That is, with the Word. 197 Heb 2:10.

Fragment 49

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

For according to our interpretation, they continue to apply the name “son” to all who are such. For since what has been said reflects a more human way of speaking, they thought that it was right to use this term, which also happened to be his title, and that the name “Jesus” was the proper name of the one assumed, as “Peter” and “Paul” (or whatsoever one is mentioned) is that of the apostles, and he was called this [name] after his birth from Mary.

Fragment 50

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

But in response to this they say that the name “Jesus” means “Savior.” So how, they say, might a human being be called “Savior”? They have forgotten that the son of Nun was also called “Jesus.”¹⁹⁸ And the truly amazing thing is that he was not called this through some chance turn of events at his birth, but rather he had his name changed by Moses.¹⁹⁹ Now it is clear that he would not have tolerated this [name] being giving to²⁰⁰ a human being if it were really indicative of the divine nature in every case.

Fragment 51

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek and Latin)

“In²⁰¹ many and various ways long ago God spoke to the fathers in the prophets, but in these last²⁰² days he has spoken to us in a Son.”²⁰³ For here it is clearly indicated that by “in a Son” he means “in the human being.” “For²⁰⁴ to which of the angels did he ever say, ‘You are my Son, today I have begotten you?’”²⁰⁵ He is saying that he made none of the angels a sharer in the dignity of the Son. When he said, “I have begotten you,” as if thereby

198 That is, Joshua. 199 See Num 13:16.

200 Reading *ep'* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *ap'*.

201 The translation begins with the Greek.

202 Reading *eschatōn* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *eschatou*.

203 Heb 1:2. 204 Here the translation switches to the Latin.

205 Heb 1:5, quoting Ps 2:7.

bestowing a share in sonship, it is entirely and explicitly clear that what was said has nothing to do with God the Word.

Fragment 52

From Book 12

(Translated from Latin)

In response to this, however, the blessed Apostle tries to show how he²⁰⁶ is a sharer in divine honor and that he enjoys this, not because of his own nature, but because of the indwelling power.

Fragment 53

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

Accordingly, [Paul] not only calls [Jesus] “Son” to distinguish him from God the Word, but he is also proven to be classifying him in the category of sonship along with the rest of those who participate in sonship. For he participates in sonship by grace, having not been begotten naturally from the Father, even though he has a preeminence in comparison to the rest because he has come to possess sonship through his union with him, which fact graces him with a more authoritative share in the reality.

Fragment 54

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

“And you will call his name Jesus. He will be great and will be called Son of the Most High.”²⁰⁷ See, then, how when [Gabriel] announces the good news of the birth from Mary (I mean the one according to the flesh), he orders that he be called “Jesus” but foretells that he will be called “Son of the Most High.” It makes sense that he orders the former to be given as the proper name of the one being born but foretells that he will be called the latter, since the name was a symbol of the honor which eventually his share in the reality would confirm.

²⁰⁶ That is, Jesus. ²⁰⁷ Luke 1:31–32.

Fragment 55

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

It is clear that in making a distinction between the natures we must never lose sight of the fact that God the Word is said to be Son because of his natural begetting [from the Father] and the human being enjoys²⁰⁸ the dignity of the Son, being much greater than what he is in himself, through his conjunction with him.

Fragment 56

From Book 12

(Translated from Latin)

But if someone should want to ask what I would say Jesus Christ is, I say that he is God and Son of God.

Fragment 57

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

“It is fitting that he through whom and for whom all things [exist]” – obviously, this refers to God the Word – “in bringing many children to glory” – he means those worthy of adoption as children – “should perfect the pioneer of their salvation through suffering” – [this refers] to the human being who was assumed by him.²⁰⁹

Fragment 58

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

Therefore, on the basis of these things it has also been demonstrated sufficiently that the human being assumed by God the Word is said to be “Son of God” because of him and in relation to him.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ Reading *apolauei* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr’s *apolauein*.

²⁰⁹ Heb 2:10. ²¹⁰ That is, God the Word.

Fragment 59

From Sections 77–78

*(Translated from Syriac, Latin, and Greek)*²¹¹

<...> he did this. For it is also fitting that it was said, “of the Holy Spirit,”²¹² but it is not fitting that the divinity was formed. And next he relates what the angel said to Joseph: “Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary as your wife, for what has been conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.”²¹³ And one can find similar things [related] by the blessed Luke. For after he stated how the angel came to Mary and warned her that she was pregnant, saying, “Behold! You will conceive and you will bear a child,” etc.,²¹⁴ and Mary doubted these things, saying, “How will this come to be, since I have not known a man?”²¹⁵ [Luke] said the angel responded to her, saying, “The Holy Spirit will come and the power of the Most High will rest upon you. Thus, what is born from you will be holy; he will be called the child of the Most High.”²¹⁶ It is clear that not one of the things said here refers to the divinity.

[78] In addition to these things, let us now discuss the birth. What follows is similar: he was the one who acted according to the law, and he was diligent to keep it with full accuracy. We learn [this] sufficiently from the divine scriptures, when the evangelist says, “The child grew and became powerful in the Spirit, as he was being filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon him.”²¹⁷ In another [passage], “He went down with his parents, came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them.”²¹⁸

Latin and Greek

The Apostle also says something that agrees [with this], “And great indeed is the mystery of our piety: he²¹⁹ who was manifested in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit.”²²⁰ He says that

Syriac

And the Apostle said, “Great indeed is this mystery: he who was manifested in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit.”²²¹ Now he says “made righteous in the Spirit” in reference to him because

²¹¹ The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 17. There are two fragments that preserve the same material, one Greek and the other Latin (the opening sentence of the Latin fragment preserves a sentence that is absent in Greek; otherwise, they are identical). These parallels appear in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

²¹² Matt 1:18. ²¹³ Matt 1:20. ²¹⁴ Luke 1:31. ²¹⁵ Luke 1:34.

²¹⁶ Luke 1:35. ²¹⁷ Luke 2:40. ²¹⁸ Luke 2:51.

²¹⁹ The translation from Latin ends with “piety,” and the translation from Greek begins with “he.”

²²⁰ 1 Tim 3:16. ²²¹ 1 Tim 3:16.

Latin and Greek

he “was made righteous in the Spirit” either because before his baptism he kept the law with the appropriate accuracy or because even after that he fulfilled the life of grace with great accuracy by the assistance of the Spirit.

Let us also proceed to the baptism. It is fitting to bring [this] to mind in snippets, so as not to extend our discussion ...

Syriac

either before his baptism he kept the law with all accuracy or after that he perfected the law through his graceful way of life of the Spirit and through his diligence.

Fragment 60

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

For not even what is said by John to him – “I need to be baptized by you and you come to me?”²²² – not even this will invalidate the fact that the one being baptized is the human being. For this would be appropriate for him even by reason of his humanity since in terms of virtue itself he was greatly superior to John, and on account of the nature of the divinity indwelling in him, he was rightly acknowledged as having a dignity not only surpassing John, but also surpassing all human beings and indeed even surpassing creation.

Fragment 61

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

Therefore, the Lord, wanting to demonstrate his endurance and philosophical character during his fast, did not ask for this to happen.²²³ And showing that he cares little for food and that nothing is more valuable to him than virtue, he says to [the devil], “A human being shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.”²²⁴

Fragment 62

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

For this is what the devil was eager to do: to persuade him that God cared nothing at all for him. And therefore he said, “If you are the Son of God,

222 Matt 3:14.

223 That is, that the stones become bread.

224 Matt 4:4.

do this”²²⁵ – that is, “Do something to show that God cares for you.” And he also made great promises so that by the former²²⁶ he might separate him from God and then by the promises make him his own. And in the first temptation he put bread before him, enticing him with pleasure to succumb to the temptation.

Fragment 63

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

Therefore, the Lord bestowed upon us the victory over [the devil] by defeating him in the three [temptations]. For when he refused to ask that bread come from God, he showed that he was immune to pleasure. And when he refused to hurl himself down, he despised renown, persuading everyone that this was of no concern to him. And when he remained immune to the world’s advantages in the course of the third [temptation], he showed that he kept himself undefeated by all of them on behalf of piety.

Fragment 64

From Book 13

(Translated from Latin)

It would be good, especially at this point, to draw a conclusion about the thrust that these statements have: that he lived among us, was baptized, was crucified, died, was buried, and rose again. We do not make these statements as if we were applying them to some mere human being. For each time we explain these statements we do not hesitate to add this (lest we give calumniators an occasion for speaking evilly): the indwelling by God the Word happens from the very construction²²⁷ in his mother’s womb, and indeed this indwelling does not happen in the way an indwelling ordinarily happens nor by way of that grace known to be in many, but in a certain exceptional way, according to which we also say that both natures are united and one person is effected by way of this union.

²²⁵ See Matt 4:3 and 4:6.

²²⁶ That is, by daring Jesus to do something.

²²⁷ The Latin word here is *plasmatio*, undoubtedly a translation of the Greek *diaplasis*; see note 79 above on “construction.”

Fragment 65

From Book 14

(Translated from Greek)

Accordingly, then, such great honor has come to be associated with the human being who was deemed worthy of divine indwelling, of sitting at the right hand of the Father, and of being worshiped by all creation. For God would never have assumed a human being and united him to himself so simply and without good reason, preparing him to be worshiped by all creation, nor would he have judged it right for intellectual natures to worship him, if what had come to be associated with him were not a common benefit for all creation.

Fragment 66

From Book 14

(Translated from Greek)

We shall rightly say the same in the case of the Lord too, that God the Word, because he knew his virtue – and this according to foreknowledge right from the beginning at the start of his construction²²⁸ – and because he was well pleased²²⁹ to indwell [in him] and united himself to him by the disposition of his will,²³⁰ bestowed upon him a certain greater grace, since the grace given to him would be given to all human beings after him. Accordingly, [God the Word] kept his²³¹ intention²³² for the good intact. For we should not say that the human being lacked any intention but that he preferred the good, or rather that he had in his intention an intense affection for the good and hatred for its opposite. And the inviolateness of his intention was preserved in him from the beginning by divine grace since God knew precisely what sort of individual he would be and in fact in order to support him provided him with great assistance by his own indwelling for the salvation of us all. Accordingly, one should not speak of injustice in regard to the human being assumed by the Lord having received something exceptional in comparison to all.

²²⁸ See note 79 above on “construction.”

²²⁹ The Greek participle *eudokēsas* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

²³⁰ The ancient Latin version of this fragment translates the Greek *tēi schesei tēs gnōmēs* as *affectu voluntatis*.

²³¹ That is, Jesus’s. ²³² In Greek, *prothesin*.

Fragment 67

From Book 14

(Translated from Latin)

He holds the place of an image²³³ in two senses. For people very often set up images of their loved ones after they die thinking that this provides enough consolation for their death, and they think they see the one who is neither seen nor present by beholding him, as it were, in the image, and in this way they quench the fire and the intensity of their longing. And furthermore people who have images of the emperors throughout their cities are seen to honor, by the cult and adoration of these images, those who are not present as if they were present and visible. Now both of these [functions of image] are fulfilled by him.²³⁴ For all who are with him, and pursue virtue, and have been prepared by repaying the debts owed to God, love him and honor him very much, and the divine nature, though it is not seen, fulfills love for him in the one who is seen by all, and thus everyone supposes that they are seeing him through him²³⁵ and are always present to him. And in this way they pay every honor [to him] as if to an imperial image since it is as if the divine nature is in him and is seen in him. For even though it is the Son who is said to indwell, nonetheless the Father is also with him and it is believed by every creature that he is with the Son inseparably in every way. And the Spirit too is not absent, seeing that he functions as the anointing for him and he is always with the one who has been assumed. And we ought not marvel at this, since the Father is also said to be with the Son in all people who pursue virtue: “For the Father and I will come and make our home with him.”²³⁶ It is clear to all that the Spirit is also inseparable from such people.

Fragment 68

From Book 15

(Translated from Latin)

On account of this each one is justly called “Son,” since there exists one person which the union of the natures produces.

²³³ See Col 1:15.

²³⁴ That is, Jesus.

²³⁵ That is, seeing the Son through Jesus.

²³⁶ John 14:23.

Fragment 69

From Book 15²³⁷

(*Translated from Latin and Greek*)

Let²³⁸ no one be deceived by the wiliness of their questions. For it is truly disgraceful to put aside “so great a cloud of witnesses,”²³⁹ as the Apostle said, and having been deceived by their crafty questions to join with the party of our opponents. So what is it that they ask with such cunning? Is Mary the Anthropotokos or the Theotokos? Who was it that was crucified, God or a human being? But in fact the answer to such questions is clear as well from our previous remarks in response to their questions; nonetheless, right now let us repeat the appropriate response briefly so that they may have no further occasion for craftiness. So²⁴⁰ when they ask, “Is Mary Anthropotokos or Theotokos?” let it be said by us, “Both” – the one by the nature of the reality, the other by relation. For she is Anthropotokos by her nature since the one in the womb of Mary, who also proceeded from it, was a human being. Yet she is Theotokos, since God was in the human being that was born, not that he was circumscribed in him by nature but that he was in him according to the disposition of his will.²⁴¹ And²⁴² so, there is justification for saying both, but not according to a similar rationale. For it is not the case that just as the human being received a beginning in order to exist in the womb, so too did God the Word, since he was before every creature. And so, there is justification for saying both and each of them according to its own rationale. Moreover, the same response ought to be given if they ask, “Was it God that was crucified or a human being?” It is both, but not according to a similar rationale. For the latter was crucified in that he underwent the suffering and was nailed to the tree and was arrested by the Jews, but the former because he was with him according to the reason previously stated.

237 The ancient Latin versions of this fragment identify its source as Book 12, but the Greek fragment notes that it is from Book 15. Here the Greek text is prioritized.

238 The translation begins with the Latin of C5T3. 239 Heb 12:1.

240 Here the translation switches to the Greek of LT28.

241 The ancient Latin version of this fragment translates the Greek *kata tēn schesin tēs gnōmēs* as *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

242 Here the translation returns to the Latin of C5T3.

Fragment 70

From Book 15

(Translated from Latin and Greek)

For²⁴³ the Lord was troubled by and struggled with the passions of the soul more than with those of the body, and he subdued pleasures through his superior power of reasoning, unquestionably because the divinity acted as the mediator and assisted him in the achievement of this. Therefore,²⁴⁴ the Lord is seen engaged especially in the struggle with these. For having been neither deceived by craving for money nor tempted by desire for glory, he gave nothing to the flesh, since he could not be conquered by such things. Now if he had not received a soul and it was the divinity that conquered these things, the gain from those things he accomplished would in no way at all redound to us – for what similarity is there between the divinity and the human soul when it comes to perfection of conduct? – and the Lord's struggles would seem to have had a gain that does not redound to us but to have been for the sake of some charade. But if it is not possible to say this (since it is certain beyond a doubt that these things have been accomplished for our sake), and if he engaged in a greater struggle with the passions of the soul and a lesser one with those of the flesh, then however much it used to happen that those [passions of the soul] troubled him intensely and acutely, so much was there something that acutely stood in need of an intense remedy. In other words, in assuming both flesh and soul he used to struggle in both on behalf of both, not only mortifying sin in the flesh and calming his sensual desires and making them easily controllable by superior reason of the soul, but also instructing and training his soul both to conquer its own passions and to bridle the sensual desires of the flesh. For he did these things through the indwelling divinity; indwelling, this [divinity] acted as mediator for both of them.

Fragment 71

From an Unknown Book or Section²⁴⁵*(Translated from Syriac)*

Because of this they are outside the church of God. The fathers were right to cut them off like putrid members from a healthy body. But I would also

²⁴³ The translation begins with the Greek of LT29.

²⁴⁴ Here the translation switches to the Latin of C4T27.

²⁴⁵ This fragment has no internal indications of its original location, but it may belong to Book 15, which according to Gennadius cited “the traditions of the fathers”

like to offer a demonstration of these things: whether the fathers also spoke like this, or had the habit [of using] the name “human being.” We find this usage among many, so necessarily I wish to corroborate my argument with their testimonies and I [want to] look at the issue from all sides: from the importance of their deeds to the uprightness of their thoughts; from the proof of the scriptures to the common usage of those who have been brought to faith in Christ. [But] those who quarrel with us in their blasphemy will, contrary to all these things [I will raise], approve their [own] teachings, which they have established with something that is distinctly new and not mentioned in doctrine; and they also honor their weakness more than all their illness, while they tempt others everywhere to turn aside from the truth.

The first testimony that is appropriate for proving what I am saying comes from Hegesippus, who lived in the time of the apostles. For in his fifth book he included the words of James, the brother of our Lord Christ, and told the story of his death and how the Pharisees killed him.²⁴⁶ Then he related what his manner of life was, how he conducted himself, what garments he wore, what many thought of him on account of the excellence of his ways,²⁴⁷ and how he exhorted many Jews to have faith in Christ.²⁴⁸ And he said that on the day of the Passover many Jews gathered in the great city, along with the scribes and the Pharisees, and they said to him, “There are many who go astray in regard to the Messiah. But you, because all the people are persuaded by you on account of the excellence of your ways, go and get up on the pinnacle of the temple and turn every person away from

(see p. 421 above). Perhaps the testimonies from the apostle James, Hegesippus, and Eusebius of Caesarea discussed in this fragment were some of these “traditions.”

Alternatively, since Theodore attempts to demonstrate by appeal to patristic authorities the propriety of calling the incarnate Word as “human being,” this fragment could stem from one of the earlier sections of the book that deal with this topic (see Fragments 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, and 36).

246 Here Theodore begins to summarize the fragments of Hegesippus preserved in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.4–18.

247 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.4–7.

248 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.8–9 (GCS 9/1: 168, 2–8 Schwartz/Mommsen): “Certain individuals from the seven sects which are among the people ... tried to learn from him what the ‘gate’ of Jesus was [see John 10:1–9], and he said that he was the Savior. Some of them came to believe that Jesus was the Christ, but the aforementioned sects did not believe in either the resurrection or that he is coming to repay each according to their works [see Rom 2:6]. Now as many as came to believe did so through James.” The translation of Eusebius here and in the following notes is by Mark DelCogliano.

this opinion.”²⁴⁹ I will set down his own words; this is what he said, “The scribes and the Pharisees made James stand upon the pinnacle of the temple, and they called to him and said, ‘O just one, whom it is right for all of us to obey, since the people go astray after Jesus who was crucified, teach us what is the “gate” of Jesus?’ And he said to them with a loud voice, ‘Why are you asking me about Jesus, the Son of Man?’”²⁵⁰ With these words he showed there is another besides God the Word, which he called “Son of Man.” And he replied in reference to that one who was crucified, adding, “He sits in the heavens at the right hand of the great power, and he will come on clouds of heaven.”²⁵¹ For no one says that the divinity will arrive upon the clouds since it exists in every place. Rather, it is fitting that it is the human being that will come upon the clouds, even if it is not separate from the divinity. For this does not in any way detract from its union with the humanity. Eusebius of Caesarea quoted this account by Hegesippus in the book *Ecclesiastical History* that he wrote. Thus, as was said, there are three witnesses for this: the blessed and great James who is the brother of our Lord, Hegesippus who told his story in his book, and Eusebius who included the verbatim testimony of Hegesippus. If there were any doubt about this, namely, that it is fitting for the apostles to think like this, he would not have quoted it verbatim. He told his story because <...> it was appropriate that the one spoke it and the other told the story of the one [who spoke it].

It is acceptable, too, that in the history also Justin <...> was.²⁵² He said that it was from those who called our Lord a mere human being that Simon

249 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.10–11 (GCS 9/1: 168, 8–20 Schwartz/Mommsen): “Therefore, since many authorities were also believers [see John 12:42], there was an uproar among the Jews and scribes and Pharisees, who were saying, ‘The whole people is in danger of thinking that Jesus is the Christ.’ So when they gathered, they said to James, ‘We exhort you, restrain the people, for it has gone astray to Jesus, as if he were the Christ. We exhort you to persuade all who come for the day of the Passover in regard to Jesus. For all of us are persuaded by you since we testify about you, as does all the people, that you are righteous and that you show no partiality [see Luke 20:21]. Therefore, persuade the crowd that they not go astray in regard to Jesus. For indeed the whole people and all of us are persuaded by you. Stand, then, on the pinnacle of the temple, so that you may be manifested on high and your words may be easily heard by the whole people. For on account of the Passover all the tribes have gathered, along with the Gentiles.”

250 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.12–13 (GCS 9/1: 168, 20–25 Schwartz/Mommsen). The question is about the “gate” to the sheepfold in John 10:1–9.

251 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.13 (GCS 9/1: 170, 1–2 Schwartz/Mommsen). Hegesippus echoes the language of Matt 26:64, which itself echoes Dan 7:13.

252 Justin mentions Simon and Menander in *First Apology* 26 and 56, but the information recounted here is not found in Justin. What follows seems to be based on Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.26, which quotes Justin, *First Apology* 26.

and Menander after him, the magicians, received their origin, but not because they called him a mere human being. After discussing Menander,²⁵³ [Eusebius] said that the “evil demon” attempted to “detach” Christians from “their devotion” to God; he chose to approach “the Ebionites whom the first Christians named in view of the poor and mean opinions” they confessed “about Christ.”²⁵⁴ “For they regarded him as a mere human being only declared righteous” in an ordinary way.²⁵⁵ Previously he called them “heretics”²⁵⁶ not simply, but to narrate those things about Simon and Menander, who nullified the corporeality of our Lord by saying that he appears as in illusions.²⁵⁷ Rightly he calls them “heretics” since they are fools when it comes to the Lord’s corporeality. They also deny his divinity. For they preach that he is a mere human being, because of which Eusebius finds fault with them when <...>

Fragment 72

From an Unknown Book or Section

(Translated from Syriac)

And again, in regard to the difference between the natures that we confess <...> since it is right in the case of the rest, even as many of them <...> human beings doubted them in their perversity. For it is clear from this which things are fittingly said about the humanity and which things differ from the divinity in their distinctions, while they coincide in the unique conjunction of all those things said about our Lord and Savior

253 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.26.

254 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.27.1 (GCS 9/1: 254, 24–256, 3 Schwartz/Mommsen): “But there were others whom the evil demon was unable to detach from their devotion to the Christ of God, yet he found them liable to being snared in another way and so won them over: these are the Ebionites whom the first [Christians] suitably named in view of their poor and mean opinions about Christ.”

255 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.27.2 (GCS 9/1: 256, 3–4 Schwartz/Mommsen): “For they regarded him as ordinary and common, a human being declared righteous by progress in character, this alone, and born of the coupling of a man and Mary.”

256 In Syriac, *gvȳy acbrnyatha*, literally, “those who elect the alternate.” It is possible that this phrase is an odd rendering of the Greek *hairetikoi*, “sectarians” or “heretics.” The title given to chapter 27 at the beginning of Book 3 of the *Ecclesiastical History* is “On the heresy (*haireseōs*) of the Ebionites” (GCS 9/1: 184, 7 Schwartz/Mommsen). Perhaps that is what Theodore means when Eusebius “previously” referred to the Ebionites as “heretics.” All this, however, remains speculative.

257 It is unclear what passage of Eusebius Theodore is referring to here. Theodore appears to connect Eusebius’s words about Simon and Menander with a discussion of doceticism.

Jesus Christ. For when the natures are investigated separately in terms of what they indicate, there are some things that are fitting for the one nature and some for the other, as far as the rank of what is said about each of the natures is concerned. But when they are conjoined together in the union of the person, the two of them are spoken of in whatever way is fitting for this one [person] because of the union. For in this way too something that is separate in nature is manifested as spoken of jointly because of the union of the person <...>

<...> to whom and from whom was he born? And whose is he? In the narrative of the generations, it comes to David and from there it goes in the sequence of the succession until it finally arrives at Christ, when it says, “Matthan begot Jacob, Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, from whom Jesus was born, who is called Christ.”²⁵⁸ Now these words clearly demonstrate that it is about Christ in the flesh that he writes, and [the evangelist] even speaks of him as born from Mary. Since he was not writing about the divinity, it was necessary to show that the Messiah was born from Abraham’s seed. And lest Christ also be understood to have been born in the same sequence, he separates him from the three divisions containing fourteen [generations] each, saying, “Now the birth of the Messiah took place in this way: when Mary his mother had been betrothed to Joseph, even though they had not yet known each other, she found herself pregnant from the Holy Spirit.”²⁵⁹

Fragment 73

From an Unknown Book or Section

(Translated from Greek)

Made known by the foreknowledge of the Word, the human being born from the Virgin without seed was not separated from the Word, being conjoined to him by an identity of will,²⁶⁰ according to which, having been well pleased²⁶¹ [with him] he united him to himself and showed him to be indistinguishable from him in terms of activity²⁶² and to possess undividedly

²⁵⁸ Matt 1:15–16.

²⁵⁹ Matt 1:18.

²⁶⁰ In Greek, *tautotēti gnōmēs*.

²⁶¹ In Greek, *eudokēsas*, a participle cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

²⁶² Here I follow the emendation of *kai tēn energeian* to *kata tēn energeian* suggested by Richard Price, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014), 355.

the same sovereignty and authority and also a worship that, by the law of equality, cannot be distinguished.

APPENDIX

ST = Fragments preserved by Severus of Antioch in various works

LT = Fragments preserved by Leontius of Byzantium, *Unmasking and Triumph over the Nestorians*

FT = Fragments preserved by Facundus of Hermiane, *In Defense of the Three Chapters*

C4 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Fourth Session

C5 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Fifth Session

C6 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Sixth Session

BT = Fragments preserved in *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius*

BL = British Library Cod. Add. 14669

Jansen = Jansen's numbering

|| = parallel fragment (whether partial or full)

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
1.	I	–	BT (Syriac)	–
2.	I	–	C4T25 (Latin)	I
	–	11	BT1 (Syriac)	–
3.	–	33	BT2 (Syriac)	–
4.	–	35	BT3 (Syriac)	–
5.	–	36	BT4 (Syriac)	–
6.	–	36	BT5 (Syriac)	–
7.	–	37	BT6 (Syriac)	–
8.	–	38	BT7 (Syriac)	–
9.	–	42–43	BL fol. 4 (Syriac)	–
10.	–	49–50	BL fol. 7 (Syriac)	–
11.	–	50	BT8 (Syriac)	–
12.	–	51	BT9 (Syriac)	–

CEEWCW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
13.	–	51	BT ₁₀ (Syriac)	–
14.	5	52	FT ₁₇ (Latin)	III
15.	6	54	FT ₁₈ (Latin)	IV
16.	–	–	BL fol. 15 (Syriac)	–
17.	6	54	FT ₁₉ (Latin)	V
18.	–	56	BT ₁₁ (Syriac)	–
19.	–	–	BL fol. 5 (Syriac)	–
20.	6	–	BL fol. 6 (Syriac)	–
21.	7	–	LT ₁ (Greek)	VI
	7	–	C ₄ T ₃₀ (Latin)	–
22.	7	–	LT ₂ (Greek)	VII
	–	59	BT ₁₂ (Syriac)	–
	–	–	ST ₄ (Syriac)	–
	–	59	BT ₁₃ (Syriac)	–
23.	7	59	LT ₃ (Greek)	VIII
	–	59	BT ₁₄ (Syriac)	–
24.	7	–	LT ₄ (Greek)	IX
	–	–	ST ₁ (Syriac)	–
	–	60	BT ₁₅ (Syriac)	–
25.	–	60	BT ₁₆ (Syriac)	–
26.	7	–	C ₄ T ₃₁ (Latin)	X
27.	8	–	LT ₅ (Greek)	XI
28.	–	–	BL fol. 2 (Syriac)	–
29.	–	–	BL fol. 1 (Syriac)	–
30.	–	62–63	BL fol. 10 (Syriac)	–
	8	–	LT ₆ (Greek)	XII
	8	–	C ₄ T ₂₉ (Latin)	–
	–	63	BT ₁₇ (Syriac)	–
	8	–	LT ₇ (Greek)	XIII
31.	–	–	BL fol. 3 (Syriac)	–
32.	9	–	LT ₈ (Greek)	XIV
33.	9	–	FT ₂₅ (Latin)	XV+XVI
34.	9	–	LT ₉ (Greek)	XVII
35.	–	66	BT ₁₈ (Syriac)	–
36.	–	66	BT ₁₉ (Syriac)	–
37.	10	70	FT ₂₀ (Latin)	XVIII

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
38.	10	–	LT ₁₀ (Greek)	XIX
39.	10	–	LT ₁₁ (Greek)	XX
40.	–	–	BL fol. 8 (Syriac)	–
41.	–	–	C ₅ T ₁ (Latin)	XXI
	10	–	LT ₁₂ (Greek)	XXI
42.	10–11	–	BL fol. 11 (Syriac)	–
43.	11	–	BL fol. 12–13 (Syriac)	–
	–	73	BT ₂₀ (Syriac)	–
	–	73	BT ₂₁ (Syriac)	–
	11	–	C ₆ T ₁ (Latin)	XXII
44.	–	–	BL fol. 9 (Syriac)	–
45.	–	73	BT ₂₂ (Syriac)	–
46.	–	77	BT ₂₃ (Syriac)	–
47.	12	–	LT ₁₃ (Greek)	XXIII
48.	12	–	LT ₁₄ (Greek)	XXIV
	–	–	C ₅ T ₂ (Latin)	–
	–	–	C ₄ T ₄₈ (Latin)	–
49.	12	–	LT ₁₅ (Greek)	XXV
50.	12	–	LT ₁₆ (Greek)	XXVI
	12	–	C ₄ T ₄₉ (Latin)	–
51.	12	–	LT ₁₇ (Greek)	XXVII
	–	–	C ₅ T ₅ (Latin)	XXVII
52.	12	–	C ₆ T ₃ (Latin)	XXVIII
53.	12	–	LT ₁₈ (Greek)	XXIX
	12	–	C ₄ T ₅₀ (Latin)	–
54.	12	–	LT ₁₉ (Greek)	XXX
55.	12	–	LT ₂₀ (Greek)	XXXI
56.	12	–	FT ₂₁ (Latin)	XXXII
57.	–	77	BT ₂₄ (Syriac)	–
58.	–	77	BT ₂₅ (Syriac)	–
59.	–	77–78	BL fol. 17 (Syriac)	–
	13	–	C ₄ T ₅₅ (Latin)	XXXIII
	13	–	LT ₂₁ (Greek)	XXXIII
60.	13	–	LT ₂₂ (Greek)	XXXIV
61.	13	–	LT ₂₃ (Greek)	XXXV
62.	13	–	LT ₂₄ (Greek)	XXXVI

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
63.	13	–	LT ₂₅ (Greek)	XXXVII
64.	13	–	FT ₃ (Latin)	XXXVIII
65.	14	–	LT ₂₆ (Greek)	XXXIX
66.	14	–	LT ₂₇ (Greek)	XL
67.	14	–	C ₄ T ₁₇ (Latin)	XLI
68.	15	–	FT ₂₂ (Latin)	XLII
69.	12	–	C ₅ T ₃ (Latin)	XLIII
	15	–	LT ₂₈ (Greek)	XLIII
	–	–	ST ₂ (Syriac)	–
	12	–	C ₄ T ₄₅ (Latin)	–
70.	15	–	C ₄ T ₂₇ (Latin)	XLIV
	15	–	LT ₂₉ (Greek)	XLIV
71.	–	–	BL fol. 14 (Syriac)	–
72.	–	–	BL fol. 16 (Syriac)	–
73.	–	–	–	XLV (Greek)

Theodore of Mopsuestia,
*On the Incarnation of the Lord against
 the Apollinarians and Eunomians* (Fragments)

*Introduction and Translation of Greek
 and Latin Fragments by Mark DelCogliano*

Translation of Syriac Fragments by Ellen Muehlberger

Arrangement of Fragments and Appendix by Mark DelCogliano

INTRODUCTION

Theodore was a native of Antioch, where he was trained in rhetoric by Libanius before entering the ascetical school led by Diodore (later bishop of Tarsus). He was ordained a priest by Flavian of Antioch in 383 and then in 392 was consecrated bishop of Mopsuestia. In the course of his long episcopal tenure Theodore came to be regarded as one of the foremost theologians and exegetes of the pro-Nicene cause. In addition to numerous biblical commentaries on books of the Old and New Testaments, he produced a set of catechetical homilies explaining the Nicene Creed and the Lord's Prayer, polemical treatises such as *Against Eunomius* and *Dispute with the Macedonians*, as well as other works. Theodore's *On the Incarnation* was also polemical, according to the late fifth-century Gennadius of Marseilles:

Theodore, presbyter of the Antiochene church, a man prudent in knowledge and skillful in speech, wrote fifteen books *On the Incarnation of the Lord against the Apollinarians and Eunomians*, containing as many as fifteen thousand verses, in which he showed by the clearest reasoning and by the testimonies of scripture that just as the Lord Jesus had the fullness of deity, so too he had the fullness of humanity. He taught also that a human being consists only of two substances, that is, soul and body, and that mind and spirit are not different substances, but inborn faculties of the soul

through which it is inspired and is rational and makes the body capable of sensation. Moreover, the fourteenth book of this work is properly devoted to discussing the uncreated and alone incorporeal and all-ruling nature of the holy Trinity and also the rationality of creatures, which he explains insightfully on the authority of the holy scriptures. But in the fifteenth volume he confirms and strengthens the whole body of his work by citing the traditions of the fathers.¹

According to Gennadius, then, Theodore wrote the massive *On the Incarnation* before his appointment as bishop while he was still a presbyter; thus his work represents a pro-Nicene Christological outlook of the 380s or early 390s. This was the period in which pro-Nicenes were actively confronting the Christologies of the Apollinarians and Heteroousians (also called Eunomians) as live options, such as was done by Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. And herein lies the importance of this work: it is a crucial non-Cappadocian witness to emerging pro-Nicene Christology as it developed in response to the perceived threats of Apollinarius and Eunomius but decades before dyophysite language became problematized through Nestorius. We see in Theodore, then, a Christology that is very much a work-in-progress as he attempts to work out the categories, concepts, and contours with which to articulate his understanding of Christ.

A few years after Theodore's death in 428, Cyril of Alexandria identified him, in spite of his reputation for unimpeachable orthodoxy during his lifetime, as a forerunner of Nestorius, an association that quickly tainted the legacy of Theodore. This eventually led to the condemnation of Theodore's person and writings as one of the so-called Three Chapters at the Council of Constantinople in 553.² Accordingly, some works of his, including *On the Incarnation*, survive only in Greek, Latin, and Syriac fragments, the latter due to the esteem in which Theodore was held by the Church of the East.

Fragments of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* survive in various treatises and collections. All the Greek fragments are preserved in Leontius of Byzantium's *Unmasking and Triumph over the Nestorians* from the early 540s.

1 Gennadius of Marseilles, *On Illustrious Men* 12 (PL 58: 1067–1068).

2 See *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople*, translated in CEECW 4 on pp. 341–389.

There are Latin fragments in Facundus of Hermiane's *In Defense of the Three Chapters* from 550, as well as in the Acts of the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth sessions of the Council of Constantinople in 553. Syriac fragments are found in the fifth-century florilegium known as *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* and in British Library Cod. Add. 14669, a mutilated sixth- or seventh-century manuscript that originally contained a complete Syriac translation of *On the Incarnation*. In most cases, the original location of the fragment is indicated, whether the book number or the section number or both. (It appears that, in addition to its division into fifteen books, *On the Incarnation* was also divided into sections, numbered sequentially from the beginning to the end of the treatise, and thus overlapped with the division into fifteen books.) Accordingly, the extant fragments below are placed in their original order as far as can be determined. Several fragments lack any internal indication of their original order, but sometimes the contents of a fragment offer clues to its approximate original location. In these cases a justification for where the fragment is placed in this translation appears in a footnote. In three cases no conjecture could be made about the original location of the fragment; these are simply placed after all the others. The original location of each fragment, if known, is indicated in the title of each fragment.

There are 73 unique fragments in total. Some are preserved in multiple languages. The translations below are always based on the original Greek if it is available. If a fragment is not extant in Greek, then the translation is based on the Latin version if one is available. Only in cases where neither the Greek original nor a Latin version is available is the translation below based on the Syriac. In a few cases fragments preserved in British Library Cod. Add. 14669 (whose Syriac translation of the original Greek is lacunose and difficult) can be presented with two columns, the left-hand column containing parallel fragments preserved in Greek, Latin, or a different Syriac translation. Whenever possible, the translators have made reference to the different language versions of the same fragment to gain insight from the ancient translators' interpretations.

With the exception of the Syriac fragments in British Library Cod. Add. 14669, the fragments of *On the Incarnation* were preserved by someone opposed to Theodore's views. Accordingly, since these fragments were selected and quoted precisely because they were deemed to reveal the most problematic aspects of Theodore's Christology, a reader must work carefully with these fragments and not interpret them through the polemical

lens intended by those who preserved them. In the case of all the fragments, they are removed from their original contexts, which often makes reading them difficult – it is like hearing only a snippet of a wider conversation. They can seem cryptic, and a reader will have to work to reconstruct the questions or problems they are attempting to answer.

While it is difficult to summarize the Christological teaching of a treatise that survives in such a fragmentary state, certain repeated themes can be highlighted here. For Theodore, the purpose of the incarnation was soteriological, to undo the fallen human condition into which humanity sank in consequence of the sin of Adam. He insists that in Christ there is a union of two distinct, intact, and complete natures (humanity and divinity) in a single person. Against Apollinarians and Eunomians, he affirms that Christ had a human soul. In fact, he teaches that Christ struggled with desire in both flesh and soul yet overcame those temptations through the assistance of the indwelling divinity. Thus did the assumed human being achieve moral perfection. The union of humanity and divinity in Christ began at the moment of the conception of the assumed human being, enabling the human being to be preternaturally endowed with moral excellence. At the same time this union is presented as a reward for the assumed human being, whom God foreknew would make moral progress and advance to human perfection with the assistance of the indwelling Word. The precise details of this cooperation between the indwelling Word and indwelt human being remain somewhat fuzzy.

Theodore also spends considerable energy identifying the proper conceptual categories to use when trying to understand the incarnation. He speaks of it in terms of a “union,” “conjunction,” “assumption,” or “indwelling,” but he rejects “mixture.” Theodore is known for speaking of God indwelling in Christ “by good pleasure” and that concept is also on display in these fragments. What he means by this is that God indwells in Christ according to the favorable disposition of his will, not by substance or activity. God also indwells the prophets, apostles, and saints by good pleasure, but not in the same way that he indwells in Christ by good pleasure. For in Christ God indwells by good pleasure “as in a Son” (Heb 1:2), by which Theodore means that there is a union of the indweller and the assumed human being, who thereby comes to share in every honor and title of God and becomes one person with him. Thus Christ can be called “Son of God” (by grace) because of his conjunction with the Word (who is Son of God by nature). Theodore resists the charge that his Christology implies that

there are two sons. Likewise, the incarnate Word can also be called a “human being,” though Theodore is clear that he is not a “mere human being.”

The Greek and Latin fragments have been edited by Till Jansen, *Theodor von Mopsuestia De Incarnatione* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009),³ and all the original language fragments of *On the Incarnation* by John Behr, *The Case against Diodore and Theodore* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). The following translations are based on Behr, with reference to Jansen when possible and to Brian Daley’s edition of the works of Leontius of Byzantium (*Leontius of Byzantium: Complete Works* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017]) in the case of the fragments preserved by him. See the Appendix to this translation for a table correlating our fragment numbers both to the codes that Behr assigned to each fragment and to Jansen’s numbering of the fragments. The table also lists the internal indications of the original location of each fragment.

TRANSLATION

Fragment 1

From Book 1

(Translated from Syriac)

Since many have gone astray in various ways about the doctrine of the incarnation <...>

Fragment 2

From Book 1, Section 11

(Translated from Latin)

So then, just as Nathanael, by a confession such as this one,⁴ is revealed to be lacking knowledge of his divinity (in hoping for such things, Jews and Samaritans were as far as possible from the knowledge of God the Word), so too Martha, by her confession,⁵ is shown at that time to be lacking knowledge of his divinity, and moreover it is obvious that not even the

3 Jansen’s Fragment II is omitted because it consists of excerpts from Theodore’s homilies; it is not a fragment of *On the Incarnation*; see Richard Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 258 n. 147.

4 See John 1:49, “Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are King of Israel.”

5 See John 11:27, “You are the Christ, the Son of God, the one coming into the world.”

blessed Peter [had knowledge of his divinity].⁶ For until that point it was enough for those who received that revelation back then to understand that there was something exceptional and superior about him beyond the imagination of other human beings. But it was only after the resurrection, when they had been brought by the Spirit to knowledge, that they received perfect knowledge of the revelation. At that point they came to know that something exceptional had come to him beyond [that which comes to] other human beings, not in terms of some simple honor from God as is the case with other human beings, but through union with God the Word, through which participation in every honor is given to him after his ascension into heaven.

Fragment 3

From the Beginning of Section 33

(Translated from Syriac)

The Apostle said, “Just as sin arose in the world through one human being, and through sin, death,”⁷ so too did grace abound for many through one human being, Jesus Christ.⁸ In light of this it is normal that people ask about the implications of the words of the apostles even when they in fact know, and declare that they are persuaded by, the apostolic sayings. When they are not persuaded, though, asking us, “What is the answer to the problem?” we are happy to respond to this question, considering it our pride [to offer] a defense on behalf of the apostolic words. And so, we say: It was right that the human being had to find a solution, through his way of life, for his disobedience. But the mere human being was not able to conquer sin’s power when he struggled with it, since it had been implanted in our very nature for such a long time. [Sin] possessed the soul, since [the soul] became easily subjugated to that which it had wanted to struggle with – for behold, it was conquered by fighting against it. The indwelling of God the Word became necessary, so that, with humanity’s disposition to correct conduct preserved unharmed through the aid of God the Word who had made it fully capable, humanity might easily escape sin and find a solution to the disobedience that came about through the first of those formed like us.⁹

6 See Matt 16:16, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” See also Mark 8:29 and Luke 9:20.

7 Rom 5:12. 8 See Rom 5:14. 9 That is, Adam.

Fragment 4

From Section 35

(Translated from Syriac)

For our Lord's struggles were similar; they were not more useful than ours, though they were somewhat more noticeable. Even if it is not possible to say this, it is obvious that he took up a great struggle on our behalf against the passions of the soul. That struggle taken up against the passions of the flesh was less serious, given how much more it took to endure those of the soul. This is because the soul needed more healing. But it is obvious that, once he had taken up flesh and soul, he struggled in both and for both, mortifying sin in the flesh and subjecting its desires, making them easily conquerable by the superior reason of the soul. He was disciplining the soul, training it so it could subjugate its own passions and oppress the desires of the flesh. For when the divinity indwelt these things, it began to rule each of them. The grace of the Holy Spirit was also assisting with this, just as the blessed Apostle said too: "Great indeed is the mystery of godliness: he who was revealed in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit."¹⁰ Because we ourselves are also going to receive the assistance of the Spirit to attain to the perfection of righteousness <...>

Fragment 5

From Section 36

(Translated from Syriac)

Since later he was going to give the assistance of the Spirit to human beings, who were going to need it for the fulfillment of perfect excellence,¹¹ first he gave it to the one who was assumed.

Fragment 6

From Section 36

(Translated from Syriac)

Like when he was speaking with his disciples about the gift of the Spirit, which was going to come to them, he said, "He will glorify me, for he will

¹⁰ 1 Tim 3:16. ¹¹ Alternatively, "virtue."

take what is mine and declare it to you.”¹² He did not say “from me” but “from what is mine.”

Fragment 7

From Section 37

(Translated from Syriac)

Yet he also said that he performs miracles by the Spirit of God. He said, “But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons”¹³ So who is silly enough to say about God the Word that he casts out demons by the Spirit of God? Because this is a human thing: human beings do not have sufficient power of their own to perform miracles. It is proper, though, to speak this way of the one who was assumed.

Fragment 8

From Section 38

(Translated from Syriac)

The saying of our Lord – “Do not fear those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; rather, fear more the one who can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna” – also indicates this.¹⁴ Thus their silly thought is proved wrong. For he who considers the will of the soul also thereby condemns the assumption of the flesh with the soul, which is superior to the flesh. They should not think this way! For excellence¹⁵ is from the will, but the will also needs God’s assistance for it, since it is drawn by inclination toward sin. Therefore, when our Lord assumed humanity, he gave it a great grace, namely, he removed the embedded sin from its flesh, and from its soul [he removed] the easy tendency toward the passions and the inclination toward sin. In this way he removed, on the one hand, the fervor of desire from the flesh where it resides, and on the other, he voided the grip of the passions on the soul. It was not that he removed the passions and impulses themselves, for [the body and soul] are still driven by both of them. But he has driven away their power and has given the soul suitable instruction by his own way of life. He made [the soul] invincible to its own passions, and by the superiority of good thoughts the attack of wicked [thoughts] will be repelled, so as to corral the desire of the flesh in the intention toward the good, being supported by the assistance of the Spirit.

¹² John 16:14.

¹³ Matt 12:28.

¹⁴ Matt 10:28.

¹⁵ Alternatively, “virtue.”

Fragment 9

From Sections 42–43

(Translated from Syriac)

By all means, the soul has rationality. For if mortal beings have natural movements in their own life, those which are immortal have it all the more, as their life is immortal. They have responsive and powerful minds. But maybe they'll say, "We didn't say that the soul does not have rationality." Well then, let them tell us why a third nature, which they call "mind," is required, and why they point to its sustenance, or why it assists and completes the human being. If the vitality of the body is administered by the soul, then the mind is also in [the soul], such that by it the divine nature is recognized; it also establishes all activity and administers all the guidance of the things that have been and those that will be – for these things all follow from the rational nature [that it has]. What then do the heretics say is the argument for the third nature that they invent and call "mind"?

The soul does not naturally have functions and activities like those of the body. Naturally, one calls the thing that sees "the eye," and naturally one calls the thing that hears "the ear," and naturally one calls the thing that is moved to make words "the tongue." Each of the members naturally has movements that move it. And if the soul in its turn is the same, it would require something else for its sustenance and vitality, just as these members also require the soul, by which they are sustained and are moved to the use of their actions. When the soul is removed, the remaining members of the body are not just voided, but they are truly destroyed; they [by themselves] were not sufficient for the form and sustenance of their soul.¹⁶

And as the soul is not so¹⁷ – indeed, it is not, for it naturally lives in its hypostasis¹⁸ by God's grace, administering life and sustenance for the body – then it is clear that it is immortal and does not have natural movements. Instead in the mind it turns to whatever it chooses.

But the heretics do not grant these things nor deem them fitting. What's more, they do not consider the teaching of the sacred books. Rather, for the demonstration of their position – that the human being is constituted from three natures – they summon for us a testimony from the blessed

¹⁶ The soul that inhabited them.

¹⁷ That is, requiring something else for its sustenance and vitality.

¹⁸ In Syriac, *qnoma*.

Paul, in which he said, “May the God of peace sanctify you entirely, and may all your spirit and soul and body be without fault until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹⁹ [43]²⁰ And this testimony, which they cite in order to question us, they “understand” foolishly.

And they summon another text, that Jesus “grew in stature and wisdom and in grace, before God and before human beings.”²¹ They are not Apollinarians, who deny the mind of the soul. Nor are they Eunomians, who like to inquire into and examine the assumption of the soul, similarly to those who reject that the soul was assumed. Both groups know that this testimony is contrary to their teaching. For if, according to [the second group’s] position, he did not assume a soul, or, according to what [the others] say, he assumed a soul but not a mind – as if there is anyone who says that the soul of the human being can exist with no mind! – how then did Jesus “grow in wisdom”? If he says that it was the divinity that grew in wisdom – well, even they wouldn’t dare to say this to us in their madness. And the body didn’t “grow in wisdom,” that much is clear. So, it seems obvious that he assumed a rational soul, for that is how it was possible that he could “grow in wisdom,” namely in that he received by the mind the teaching of wisdom.

Yet persisting they also say that he visibly “grew” in the estimation of human beings, while not taking in that which was [actually] said, namely “in stature and wisdom and grace,” and “before God and before human beings.” If they confess about him that he truly “grew in stature and wisdom and grace,” then obviously just as he really did grow in stature, not just in estimation, so also did he likewise truly grow in wisdom. The evangelist had prudently guarded his words and did not allow any opportunity to the wickedness of their craft, in that he said, “before God and before human beings.” Let us think regarding their position that it was in estimation before human beings that he grew. Surely, it is not that he could grow in estimation before God. For if it was before God that he grew and increased, it is clear <...>

Fragment 10
From Sections 49–50
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> that it is, or that because he is not complete, he has not given him the designation “Son.” Now, if they call God the Word “Son,” that one is

19 1 Thess 5:23.

20 Section 43 begins here.

21 Luke 2:52.

something else apart from the divine nature. Whether the body alone or the body and soul, it is not worthy of being called “the Son of God,” nor is it the perfected human being. What then should we say he is, according to their position? Quote for us a passage that is equal to these thoughts. If they say that the one who was assumed – whether they want to say it was the body, or the body with the soul – is conjoined and was complete in the one Son, how do they not grasp that this position is suitable and even agreeable to us? For we confess that the complete human being was assumed. After all, if the complete God the Word is by nature the Son of God, by birth he is from the Father. Thus, that which exists apart from that nature was not given its own personal name. Instead he is confessed by the name “Son of God” on account of his precise conjunction with God the Word.

Whatever is said regarding the Son of God obviously also applies to the one who was assumed, even as he was perfected. But we are not required to say “two sons” because of this, just as the two natures are soul and body, but are not the same as one another. This much is clear: even they confess this! For if the two natures which were assumed are not the same as one another, they are also not [the same as] God the Word who assumed them, nor do they constitute another person from them and for them, on account of their conjunction with God the Word. It is clear that not even the third nature – which is the mind, according to their position – does this, even if it is additional. For if there are two, body and soul, belonging to God the Word who assumed them, and he is truly the Son who is named and confessed to be with him according to the precise conjunction, it is obvious that even if this is a third nature, it does not in any way oppose our position in this matter. Just as these two natures are named and confessed with the name of the excellent nature – that is, of the one who assumed them – because of the precise conjunction, so too, even if there is a third nature, it is called “Son of God” and spoken of as though it is not separate from God the Word. And we do not concede anything else beyond “divine nature,” that in his own person itself and for him is known and named the “Son of God.” But by the name of “Son of God” we designate that one who was assumed, even if he is the one who is a complete human being. But if in their madness they say that “the mind is superior to the divinity of the Only-Begotten in that human being and it is right that from it, as from something superior, the other person of the human nature be named” – for such things are said to us – since we reject their position that “the mind is another nature beyond the soul and body,” we have already demonstrated above with the aid of God that they are not so.

[50] But they say that neither is it right to apply to Christ the name of the “human being,” nor is it fitting that he be called by this phrase.²² The fact that they think this is a demonstration of their ignorance and of how poorly acquainted they are with the holy scriptures. For it is plainly known to all who wish to perceive it that we find this name in many places in the holy scriptures. For our Lord said to the Jews, “Why do you wish to kill me? I am a human being who speaks the truth to you.”²³ And in a different place, when the Slanderer said, tempting him, “Make these stones into bread,” he answered him, “It is written that the human being does not live by bread alone.”²⁴ It is obvious that, if what was assumed was not a human being yet had a conflict with the Slanderer, [the Slanderer] would not fight with him to tempt him. For he thought that he was just what was visible and did not sense the divine nature that was residing in him. If he had known, he would not have dared to tempt him. Surely, strictly speaking, if he had sensed the divine nature, he would know also this: that he is above every temptation. Thus, he did not answer fittingly.

Fragment 11

From Section 50

(Translated from Syriac)

Just as death came through a human being, so too does the resurrection of the dead come through a human being. According to what is known, it is not fitting that resurrection be granted to humanity in any other way except by the one who is like in nature to the nature of the one who was the cause of death.²⁵ It is also right for him who is the cause of the resurrection to be the same.

Fragment 12

From Section 51

(Translated from Syriac)

For God is not said to wear flesh, for no one says, “God wears flesh.” Let us say once more, “the human being in whom God dwelled.” That is, it is not absurd for him to wear God, which is what they hasten to attack, as if it were clearly an absurdity. If he is said to be a human being, as we have

22 In Syriac, *bart qala*.

23 John 8:40.

24 Matt 4:4.

25 That is, Adam.

shown from the divine scripture, then it is in this one that God the Word dwelled. Whether “he is in him,” or however they choose to say it, it is not absurd to say the human being “wore” God, the one who dwelled in him.

Fragment 13

From Section 51

(Translated from Syriac)

For they ask this especially: Is Christ one thing and the Son of God another thing? Or is this one Christ and the other one the Son of God? If anyone answers and says, “He is one and the same,” then they immediately think their illness is upheld.

Fragment 14

From Book 5, Section 52

(Translated from Latin)

When someone distinguishes the natures, he necessarily finds one thing and another thing. And not even they,²⁶ I think, will object to this fact because we all agree that God the Word by nature is one thing and what is assumed is another thing, whatever it may be. At the same time, however, he is found to be the same as that [which is assumed] in terms of person, not by the natures being confused in any way but on account of the union that the assumed made with the assumer. For if we are honest when we agree that the latter is other than the former by nature, and it is clear that the assumed is not equal to the assumer, with neither the latter being similar to the former nor the assumed the same as the assumer, then it is clear that he will be found to be the same by reason of the union of the person. So then, it is appropriate to divide that which concerns Christ, for there is nothing contradictory in these divisions – after all, they are in utter harmony with the divine scriptures. In this way there will be neither a confusion of the natures nor a kind of wicked division of the person. For the principle of the natures must remain unconfused and it must be recognized that the person is undivided – the former by reason of the property of the nature, in that the assumed is distinct from the assumer, whereas the latter by reason of the union of the person, in that the nature, whether of the assumer or even that of the assumed, is accounted for in the single designation for the whole.

²⁶ Presumably Theodore's opponents.

Accordingly, to use an example, as soon as we call upon God the Word using the designation “Son,” at the same time we co-signify the assumed nature, whatever it may be, on account of the union that it has with him.

Fragment 15
From Book 6, Section 54
(*Translated from Latin*)

So then, though they²⁷ seem to be justified in calling us “human-worshippers”²⁸ because we call Christ a human being, prior to our saying this, scripture taught all human beings [the same] through those [passages] in which it does not refuse to call [Christ] a human being, just as we have shown above that in many passages Christ is called by this name. But it is fitting, they say, for those who call Christ a mere human being to be called human-worshippers. Now, this is a blatant lie, if they really should want to say this! For no one has ever heard us say such things, and I do not think that even they could pretend to allow such a blatant lie, not because they are unacquainted with lying but because they see that they can be refuted most easily – although if they should be careless, perhaps it would come even to this! For we ourselves think that to say this, that is, to deny the divinity of the Only-Begotten, is the height of madness. Otherwise, what reason now remains for why we are separated from the heretics? For what reason have we endured both such great and so many persecutions? Or who does not know that war is constantly waged against us by the heretics? Every mine and every deserted place is filled with our people on account of the doctrine of piety.²⁹

Fragment 16
From an Unknown Book or Section³⁰
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> many were taken up. And there was a slight diminishment of the danger that the whole mass of the people would perish in this error. The

27 Presumably Theodore’s opponents. 28 In Latin, *hominicolae*.

29 That is, allies of Theodore have been sentenced to work in the mines or sent into faraway exile for their views.

30 Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, it is connected with Fragment 17, which also deals with Meletius of Antioch. Since Fragment 17 sums up the discussion of Meletius, it seems best to place this fragment before it.

entire East was confused with this opinion.³¹ And some of those who were reckoned to have perfect knowledge of the faith in regard to the Son of God but whose understanding in regard to the Holy Spirit was not [yet] sound were only later confirmed and perfected in the knowledge of the truth.³² At that time, the blessed bishop Meletius preached this faith with great boldness of speech, forsaking the honor that he had before the emperor or the magistrates. And even though he was aware that after his preaching he would be excluded from the honor and love of the emperor and the magistrates, he despised all this, and with bravery and excellence he preached the faith of the church. It is right that we accurately cite the words of his homily to explain and confirm what we are saying. For he said, "They are understood to be three, but we speak of them as one."³³ And immediately there was a great upheaval in the church and the uproar of the people kept getting louder and louder, for they were all amazed at the boldness of his doctrine, and the grace of God was established in the minds of all the people. But the enemies of the truth groaned very bitterly when they saw that all their schemes would be dissolved in a short time. For the bravery of his preaching and the boldness of his teaching were the confirmation of the fear of God³⁴ and a great rebuke of those who little by little were chipping away at the solid foundation of the faith. The words of his teaching could not be heard on account of the people's uproar. Not even if someone had used a horn would it have been possible to hear because of how loud the great uproar was. And then the blessed bishop Meletius fulfilled the function of the tongue with his holy hands, as he wished that all his members might become a mouth and that he might preach the truth through all of them.³⁵ And this blessed one was made holy by the confession of his

31 The "opinion" mentioned by Theodore is "Arianism."

32 Theodore is talking about some group active in the early 360s which later generations would call Pneumatomachians, Macedonians, or Homoiousians but which eventually adopted the pro-Nicene position. In the next sentence he appears to place Meletius in this group.

33 These words were spoken after Meletius preached the homily before Emperor Constantius II that is preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.29–33; see Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.31 and Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.28. Theodoret preserves the original Greek of Meletius's words: *tria ta noumena bōs henī de dialegometha* (GCS n.F. 5: 172, 12–13 Parmentier/Hansen).

34 "Fear of God" here means "true piety."

35 As reported by Theodoret and Sozomen (see note 33 above), an "Arian" archdeacon attempted to stop Meletius from speaking by covering his mouth with his hand. Meletius

mouth, though before the confession of the church they³⁶ had been ruthlessly persecuted with the punishment of death, and they were not permitted to gather together for the service of prayer and the thanksgiving to the Lord God of all. For in Antioch of Syria, the emperors on many occasions had threatened and commanded that they be thrown in the river. For they used to assemble and gather at the river at that time. Our words do not suffice such as they are, but the deeds themselves already proclaim such words <...>

Regarding the blessed bishop Meletius (may his memory be a blessing!), who by his blessed way of life was [firmly established] in divine truth and who was much loved and greatly honored the emperor, why was he expelled from the city of Antioch and sent into exile?³⁷ Was it not the boldness of his preaching about the doctrine of the fear of God? For all the East was confused about the contents of the faith. Back then the heretics were not separated, but mixed together in one congregation were both those who with great care adhered to the teaching of faith in the fear of God and those who concealed the deceit of their error in their mind. Those of the right belief feared to preach the truth of their faith with boldness, since at that time the [heretics] were stronger than they were. [The heretics] knew that the crown and the magistrates belonged to the opposing opinion, and they were guided by the will of the emperor as if it were their own will, and also they subjugated their own opinion to that of many magistrates, [by accepting] abundant gifts for the provision of the church and all those who were ill in their opinions. For the people were not yet accustomed to understanding the blasphemy against the Son of God. For in this period when that wickedness began, they did not yet dare express their opinions openly but hid their deceitful error and little by little subtly dismantled the faith of the simple and drew them to the teaching that leads to perdition. And thus little by little this error <...>

then held up his own hand, showing three fingers, then one finger, thereby signaling the pro-Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

³⁶ That is, pro-Nicenes like Meletius.

³⁷ Meletius was exiled from Antioch only a few months after becoming its bishop in consequence of the homily he preached before Emperor Constantius II. At the time, Meletius was not viewed as unmistakably pro-Nicene, but by the Council of Constantinople in 381 he was widely regarded as a leader of that alliance.

Fragment 17
From Book 6, Section 54
(Translated from Latin)

Now when the blessed Meletius endured all these things from the heretics, he first and then many others along with him throughout the provinces, the cities, and the countryside, what was the reason? Was it not because they were confessing that Christ was true God? Was it not because they were preaching that he was the true Son of God, begotten from the paternal essence, always existing simultaneously with the generating Father, adding also the pious confession about the Holy Spirit? And so, having suffered so much on account of this confession, how can we suffer calumny from them as if we called [Christ] “a mere human being,” seeing that the facts themselves refute this patent calumny?

Fragment 18
From Section 56
(Translated from Syriac)

“We speak wisdom among those who are perfect.”³⁸ By “wisdom” he refers to the whole preaching about Christ, in which all people have been educated, namely, that as God the Word indwelt, he directed all things in the human being. The crucifixion matters, then, not because of the nature of the passible one, but because of the power of the one who assumed him.

Fragment 19
From an Unknown Book or Section³⁹
(Translated from Syriac)

<...> as also the arrival of the magi, which magnified and blessed the birth of the Messiah. They came from a distant place so that they might worship him according to the testimony of their words. [The birth of the Messiah] was revealed to many; the evangelist testified, saying, “Herod was disturbed

³⁸ 1 Cor 2:6.

³⁹ Though this fragment has no internal indication of its original location, its content – the evidence that should have convinced the Jews to believe in Jesus Christ as God – indicates that it should be placed before Fragment 20, which implies a previous discussion of the same evidence.

and all Jerusalem with him.”⁴⁰ And many other deeds were seen after “the testimony of John [the Baptist].”⁴¹ First, our Lord performed miracles that were quite novel and wondrous. What’s more, what his disciples performed in his name were clearly great miracles; he gave them the authority to do these when he said, “Cast out demons, cleanse the lepers, cure the sick; you have freely received, so give freely.”⁴² And the fact that the blessed apostles clearly accomplished these things in his name is even more impressive than what [John the Baptist] could do. For it does not seem that anyone could ever perform miracles in the name of a human being: Joshua son of Nun did not in the name of Moses, and Elisha did not in the name of Elijah. But in fact [Elisha] did receive the gift of his spirit in double [portion].⁴³

Therefore, since all these things also made it known to the Jews that Christ was the Lord, inasmuch as he was greatly superior to Moses and all the prophets, they have no just excuse for their hardheartedness and their lack of obedience toward our Lord. It would have been right for them to obey him, since he was grander and greater than Moses and all the prophets who had come before. Because of the things he said, he was worthy of faith. [But] they abandoned the things that were necessary and thought of him in such a way as to crucify him, though there was no just cause of their hardheartedness. Yet what brought down the penalty upon them even more severely was that after the crucifixion and death of our Lord, the apostles had clearly performed signs before them, with even the shadow of the blessed Peter curing the sick before their eyes.⁴⁴ Despite all these things, the Jews abided in their evil opinion; though they had seen all these great wonders, they still subjected this apostle to shame and to imprisonment many times. But if they had wanted to repent after the crucifixion, their repentance would have been received. For we saw blessed Peter do this.⁴⁵

And [when] all those in Judaea, the scribes, and the Pharisees together with Sadducees, and all the nation of the Jews [went out to John the Baptist],⁴⁶ he not only testified that [Christ] was manifest, but he also confessed that he was much greater than him: “He is so much greater that I am not worthy to loosen the straps of his sandals.”⁴⁷ It is not that the testimony of John was received without any doubt; rather, John, who made his faith abundantly known to the Jews in all his testimony, testified about [Christ] without any

40 Matt 2:3. 41 John 1:19. 42 Matt 10:8. 43 See 2 Kgs 2:9.

44 See Acts 5:15. 45 This must refer to Peter’s repentance for denying Christ.

46 See Matt 3:5–7; Mark 1:5; John 1:19, 24. 47 Luke 3:16.

doubt. It would have been right for them to have faith in him and obey him. And it was not only a question of John's testimony, but after this a pronouncement of the Father from heaven clearly confirmed John's testimony. It said, "This is my Son, my beloved, in whom I am well pleased."⁴⁸ And in the descent of the Spirit that testimony was made abundantly manifest and confirmed – the Spirit which clearly came in the likeness of the dove.⁴⁹ What greater testimonies than these could be needed? From human beings, John testified, he who was greater than all human beings of that era.⁵⁰ From heaven, [there are the testimonies of] God, whom the Jews acknowledged as Lord of all, and the Holy Spirit, who was described as God in the Old Testament and who gave the gift of prophecy to all the prophets.

Even the events before these were not insignificant.⁵¹ For before John, Zechariah his father was informed by the angel about John's birth, which was also revealed to the whole nation of the Jews in its impiety. This was said to him about John: "He will be great in the sight of the Lord, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit; he will go before him in the power and the spirit of Elijah the prophet to prepare for the Lord a perfected people."⁵² It is clear that these words bring a great understanding about Christ to light. For inasmuch as John was excellent and great in the eyes of the Jews, the fact that he was testifying about our Lord, namely that he was greatly and immeasurably superior to him,⁵³ clearly confirms his testimony about our Lord. And along with all these things the angel also testified about the birth of our Lord when he appeared to the shepherds and said, "Today is born to you a Savior who is Christ the Lord."⁵⁴ And the shepherds quickly came to the city and told everyone.⁵⁵ And it was clear that these things were being reported throughout all of Judaea, for new things are wont to be reported and recounted by many mouths.

Fragment 20
From the Ending of Book 6
(*Translated from Syriac*)

<...> in it,⁵⁶ their faith and their repentance were acceptable. Now, because of all these things judgment is deservedly assigned to the [Jews], and the

48 Matt 3:17. 49 See Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32.

50 See Matt 11:11; Luke 7:28.

51 That is, the events before the testimony of John the Baptist.

52 Luke 1:15–17, with omissions. 53 That is, Jesus was superior to John.

54 Luke 2:11. 55 See Luke 2:15–18. 56 Or, "in him."

punishment equal to their presumption has been prepared for them, as they persisted in a rigid opinion through all of them. They were persuaded neither by the great wonders, nor by the appearance of the angels,⁵⁷ nor by the arrival of the magi, who had come from a foreign country and a distant land and would not have been aware of our Lord's birth if they had not been informed by a star and a revelation.⁵⁸ Nor were they persuaded by the voice of his Father, the Spirit's arrival, or John's testimony,⁵⁹ let alone the great miracles that our Lord clearly performed, along with those that his disciples performed in his name, before the crucifixion and after it, and all the great signs that happened at the time of the crucifixion. These things validate their condemnation and punishment even more, [a punishment] which in a little while <...> And what's more, in their perversity they used sizeable bribes to persuade the Romans guarding [the tomb] to conceal his resurrection and to act treacherously by saying, "the disciples came; they stole him in the night."⁶⁰

All these things should have been enough to bring them to the faith that was superior to that of Moses and all the prophets. It would have been good for them to believe the things that he said, and if they had followed his faith they would have been brought little by little to understanding and knowledge of God the Word, like the apostles and the rest who had faith in him. All these things by which the Jews were not persuaded were insignificant to the heretics, and because of that, they rightfully receive the decree of judgment and great punishment for their guilt. Neither by Moses nor by the rest of the prophets, and after Moses not until the coming of our Lord, do we find such things as these performed by which Christ our Lord is clearly manifest, who is beyond comparison with Moses and superior to all the prophets.

The wicked <...> except those who in their ignorance about this do not see any of these things. But they say, "If they crucified a human being, they are not condemned to judgment. Just as those who killed someone wicked are not condemned, so too those who inflicted shame on the blessed apostles are not going to receive punishment." We learn from Christ our Lord clearly that those who insult and cause the blessed apostles distress receive the same punishment as anyone who offends our Lord. They receive

57 See Matt 1:20-24; Luke 1:11-20, 1:26-38, 2:9-15. 58 See Matt 2:1-2 and 9-12.

59 Matt 3:13-17; Mark 1:9-11; Luke 3:21-22; John 1:29-34.

60 See Matt 28:13.

punishment and censure; likewise, whoever honored the Lord receives a good reward. Accordingly, those who received the apostles sent by him and honored them receive the wages and good reward [of what they have done], as he clearly says, “He who receives you also receives me, and he who receives me receives the one who sent me.”⁶¹ And in another place he says, “Whatever you have done to one of the least of these who have faith in me, you have done it to me, and what you have not done for one of the least of these, you have not done it for me.”⁶² <...> “[Amen, I say to you, it will be more tolerable] for Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgment than for them.”⁶³ If [we are talking about] the ones who contemned and dishonored those who had faith in him, this fitting punishment has been prepared for them, which it is right for those who contemned him to receive.

How, then, does the one who sins against a human being [receive] judgment and condemnation and punishment? The heretics say that if the Jews crucified a human being, there is no condemnation or punishment for them. But the truth of what has been said is clear. We have sufficiently shown that, even though they did not have knowledge of God the Word, and even though they did not perceive the divine nature that was dwelling in the human being, the Jews rightly received a punishment that was equal to their presumption. They could have come to knowledge of the truth and to faith in Christ by means of so many things. But they scorned and were not willing to be persuaded. For this reason they have no excuse for the wicked things they did in their presumption <...>

*End of the Sixth Book.*⁶⁴

Fragment 21

From Book 7

(Translated from Greek)

For if we can learn how the indwelling comes about, we shall also know the manner [of the indwelling] and how that manner [of indwelling] is distinct. Now some have claimed that the indwelling happened by substance, whereas others claim it was by activity. Let us, then, examine whether one of these is true. But first let us come to agreement on this point, whether or not [God] indwells in all people. Well, it is clear that he does not indwell

61 Matt 10:40. 62 Matt 25:40, 45. 63 Matt 10:15.

64 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

in all people. For God promises this as something special to the saints, or in general to those whom he wants to be dedicated to him. Otherwise, why did he ever promise, as though he were going to grant them something special, “I shall indwell in them and I shall walk among them, and I shall be their God and they shall be my people,”⁶⁵ if all human beings really share in this collectively? Therefore, if he does not indwell in all (for this is clear) – I do not mean in [all] beings only, but not even in [all] human beings – then there must be some distinctive principle of indwelling, according to which he is present only in those in whom he is said to indwell.

So then, to say that God indwells by substance is utterly inappropriate. For either his substance would necessarily be confined only to those in whom he is said to indwell and he will be outside all others – which is absurd to say about the infinite nature that is present everywhere and circumscribed by no place. Or else, if we were to say that God is present everywhere by reason of his substance, then all things would participate in his indwelling too, not only human beings but also even irrational creatures and lifeless things, if indeed we should say that he makes his indwelling by substance. Now both of these are clearly inappropriate. For saying that God indwells all things is recognized as sheer absurdity, and to circumscribe his substance is inappropriate or rather impious. Therefore, it would be utterly silly to say that the indwelling happens by substance.

And one could also say the same thing in regard to activity. For again, either his activity would necessarily be limited only to those [in whom he indwells], and [in this case] how would we uphold the principle that God foresees all things and arranges all things and works in all things that which is proper? Or else, if all things participated in his activity – now this is fitting and suitable, since all things are empowered by him to exist, each of them, and to act according to their proper nature – then we would be saying that he indwells all things. Therefore, it is impossible to say that God makes his indwelling either by substance or by activity.

So then, what’s left? What principle shall we use that is regarded as preserving the distinctive [manner of indwelling] in these cases? Clearly, then, it is appropriate to speak of the indwelling as happening by good pleasure.⁶⁶ Good pleasure refers to the best and noblest act of will that God can make when he is pleased with those striving to be dedicated to him

65 Lev 26:11–12, which is quoted in 2 Cor 6:16.

66 In Greek, *eudokia*.

based on his good and noble opinion of them. This [understanding of good pleasure] is derived from scripture according to its customary usage and lies within it. So the blessed David speaks in this way, “His delight shall not be in the strength of the horse, nor his good pleasure in the legs of a man, but the Lord’s good pleasure is in those who fear him and in those who hope in his mercy.”⁶⁷ By this [David] means that [the Lord] refuses to work with some and declines to assist others, but does [work with and assist] those “who fear him,” as he says. These he holds in high regard, these he has decided to assist and come to the aid of. This is the proper way, then, to speak of the indwelling. For being infinite and uncircumscribed by nature he is present to all, but by good pleasure he is far from some and near to others. In line with this idea it is said, “The Lord is near to the broken-hearted and those whose spirit is crushed he will save.”⁶⁸ And elsewhere, “Do not cast me away from your presence nor deprive me of your Holy Spirit.”⁶⁹ By means of intention⁷⁰ he is near those worthy of this nearness and in turn far from sinners: it is not by nature that he is separated and not by nature that he is brought closer, but he makes both happen by the disposition of his will.⁷¹ So just as he is near and far by good pleasure (now it is quite clear from what’s been said what we mean by good pleasure; that’s why we discussed the meaning of the term with complete precision), so too by good pleasure he accomplishes the indwelling, not by circumscribing his substance or activity in those [whom he indwells] while being separated from all others, but rather by being present to all by substance while being separated from the unworthy by the disposition of his will. For in this way is his limitlessness better preserved, when it is made plain that he is not enslaved by some necessity to the limitlessness of his nature. For if it were the case that, because he is present everywhere by substance, he is also present everywhere by good pleasure, he would be found enslaved to necessity differently because he would no longer bring about his presence by his will but by the infinitude of his nature, having his will dragged along. But since he is present by nature to all and separated from those whom he wants [to be separated from] by his will, and since none of those who are unworthy benefits from God being present, the limitlessness of his nature

67 Ps 146(147):10–11. 68 Ps 33(34):19. 69 Ps 50(51):13.

70 In Greek, *diathesei*.

71 In Greek, *teî scheseî tēs gnōmēs*, which in the ancient Latin version of Fragment 69 is translated *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

is preserved true and inviolate for him. In this way, then, by good pleasure he is present to some and separated from others, just as if he was with them by substance but separated from the rest.

Just as the indwelling comes about by good pleasure, so too does the good pleasure modify the manner of the indwelling. For that which brings about God's indwelling and that which makes it known that the one who is present everywhere by reason of his substance also indwells in a very small number of all the people – the good pleasure, I mean – this surely leaves its mark also on the manner of the indwelling. For just as he is present in all by substance without being said to indwell in all but [only] in those to whom he is present by good pleasure, so too, even if he is said to indwell, the circumstances of the indwelling are surely not identical but the manner of indwelling will also be consistent with the good pleasure. So when he is said to indwell in the prophets or in the apostles or in the righteous generally, he brings about the indwelling because he is well pleased⁷² with the righteous, because he is satisfied, as is appropriate, with the virtuous. In [Christ], however, we do not say that the indwelling came about in this way – may we never be so insane! – but “as in a Son.”⁷³ For that is the way he indwelt [in him] when he was well pleased⁷⁴ [with him]. But what does “as in a Son” mean? That he who indwelt united to himself the whole of the one assumed and caused him to share along with him in every honor in which the indweller himself, being Son by nature, participates, with the result that he effects one person by way of the union with him, and shares all his rule with him, and in this way accomplishes everything in him so that even the judgment and examination of all will be performed through him and his presence, even though the difference in their natural characteristics is clearly recognized.

Fragment 22

From Book 7, Section 59

(Translated from Greek)

As for us, then,⁷⁵ even though we will be perfectly governed by the Spirit in both body and soul in the age to come, nonetheless we now have a kind

⁷² The Greek participle *eudokōn* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

⁷³ See Heb 1:2.

⁷⁴ The Greek participle *eudokēsas* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

⁷⁵ Reading *toinun* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *toinēn*.

of partial first fruits of this, as it were, according to which by the aid of the Spirit we are under no compulsion to succumb to the disturbances of the soul. In the same way too the Lord, even though after these things⁷⁶ he had God the Word fully and wholly active in himself, with every activity of his inseparable from him, nonetheless even before this⁷⁷ he had him as much as possible accomplishing in himself most of what was required: in the period before the cross he was allowed, because of his need, to achieve virtue for our sake by his own intention,⁷⁸ but even in these matters he was supported by him and strengthened so that he could completely fulfill all the necessary things.

For right from the start, at the construction⁷⁹ in the womb, he had union with him. And when he reached the age at which discernment between what is good and what is not good naturally develops in human beings – rather, even before that age – he demonstrated a power to discern such things far more quickly and swiftly than the rest of human beings. In regard to the rest of human beings, the power of discernment does not develop in everyone in the same way at the same time: some grasp what is right more swiftly by greater intelligence, whereas others acquire this over a longer period of time by training. But this [power of discernment] came to him, in comparison to the rest, extraordinarily sooner than the typical age for human beings. It makes sense that he should have had something extra in human terms since he had not been born according to the nature typical of human beings, from the coupling of man and woman; rather, he was constructed by the divine action of the Spirit. In addition, he had an extraordinary propensity toward the good through his union with God the Word, of which he was deemed worthy by foreknowledge when God the Word from on high united him to himself. And so, because of all these things, along with discernment he immediately possessed a great hatred toward evil, and because he had conjoined himself to the good with irrepressible affection and received assistance from God the Word proportionate to his own intention, he was then preserved unaltered from any change for

76 That is, after the saving events of the economy.

77 That is, before the resurrection.

78 The Greek term here is *prothesis*, translated as “intention” when it appears in the Greek fragments. In one case “intention” translates *diathesis*: see note 70 above.

79 The Greek term *diaplasia*, “construction,” refers to the seed’s development into the embryo; it was regarded as the first stage of fetal development after conception.

the worse. This is the way he maintained [his own] will, and this is the way his intention was preserved by the assistance of God the Word.

And furthermore he pursued the most exacting form of virtue with the greatest ease, whether in keeping the law before his baptism or in pursuing a life in grace after his baptism; in this he provided us with a pattern, presenting himself as a kind of path for us in this regard. So, finally, after his resurrection and assumption into heaven, having shown himself worthy of the union on account of his own will – though he had received this union even before this, at his very construction [in the womb], by the good pleasure of the Master – finally he provides an exact demonstration of [what] the union [means], that no activity of his is separated or severed from God the Word and that he has God the Word accomplishing all things in himself through the union with himself. Accordingly, then, prior to the cross we see that he is hungry, we know that he is thirsty, we learn that he is afraid, and we discover that he is ignorant, since his intention for virtue comes from himself.⁸⁰

And the prophet Isaiah is a witness to what has been said, saying, “For before the child knows good or bad, he refuses evil in order to choose the good.”⁸¹ Clearly, it is by discernment that he hated the former and loved the latter. For surely a choice happens by discerning what is worse. So then, how does he accomplish this “before the child knows”? Here’s how: before he reached that age at which it is customary for the rest of human beings to acquire discernment between courses of action, he had something extra and exceptional in comparison to the rest of human beings. For if even among us we often find children of that age who give proof of great conscientiousness, such that they provoke wonder in onlookers because they display an innate intelligence superior to their age, by how much more must that human being⁸² have surpassed all the human beings of his time.

Fragment 23
From Book 7, Section 59
(*Translated from Greek*)

“And Jesus progressed in age and in wisdom and in grace before God and human beings.”⁸³ For he progressed “in age” as time marched on, and “in

80 Literally, “since he contributed to his intention for virtue from himself.”

81 Isa 7:16. 82 That is, Jesus. 83 Luke 2:52.

wisdom” by acquiring conscientiousness with the passage of time, and “in grace” by pursuing virtue in a way consistent with his conscientiousness and knowledge. Because of this God’s grace increased within him. And in all these [ways] he “progressed before God and human beings,” with the latter observing his progress and the former not only observing [his progress] but also testifying to it and assisting with [all] that happened. This much is clear, then, that he achieved virtue with more precision and with greater ease than was possible for the rest of human beings inasmuch as God the Word, due to his foreknowledge of what sort of individual he would be, united him to himself right at the start of the construction⁸⁴ and supplied him with greater assistance from himself for the accomplishment of what was right, arranging all that concerned him for the salvation of all. And he urged him on to more perfect things while relieving him of the greater part of his toils, whether of soul or of body. And in this way he prepared for him a greater and easier achievement of virtue.

Fragment 24

From Book 7, Section 60

(Translated from Greek)

For the one assumed according to foreknowledge was united from the beginning to God, having received the commencement of the union at his very construction⁸⁵ in the womb. Because he had already been judged worthy of the union, he received all things that⁸⁶ it made sense for a human being united to the Only-Begotten and the Master of the Universe to receive. And being judged worthy of greater things in comparison to the rest by far, the exceptional [gift] of the union came to him. Indeed, compared to the rest of human beings he was the first to be judged worthy of the indwelling of the Spirit and of this he was judged worthy in a way unlike the rest. For he received in himself the whole gift of the Spirit, but to others he gave a partial share in that whole Spirit. And in this way it came to pass that the whole Spirit was active in him. So then, what spoke, in relation to the utterance of sound, was a human being, but the force of what was said was something great and distinctive.

84 See note 79 above on “construction.”

85 See note 79 above on “construction.”

86 Reading *bosōn* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr’s *boson*.

Fragment 25

From Section 60

(Translated from Syriac)

When we speak [about him] as about God the Creator of all and as same-in-substance with the Father,⁸⁷ who is glorified with him according to natural affinity, we signify the nature of the Word. But when [we speak] about him as limited, as one who exists now beyond the heaven and is coming here at the end for a terrible transformation, then we signify the human being, who in union with [the Word] receives honor from all. He was indeed worthy of all this praise and is coming as judge of the whole world.

Fragment 26

From Book 7

(Translated from Latin)

Now the union of the person can be recognized because he accomplished all things through him – this union happened by the indwelling that is according to good pleasure. Thus, when we say that the Son of God will come as judge, we understand it to be a coming from heaven of both the human being and God the Word simultaneously – not because God the Word is conveyed according to nature like the human being, but because he is united with him in every way by his good pleasure, wherever he is, because he accomplished all things through him.

Fragment 27

From Book 8

(Translated from Greek)

“The glory that you have given me I have given them.”⁸⁸ What kind [of glory] is this? Participation in adopted sonship. For he received this according to his humanity, first of all when he was baptized in the Jordan, where our baptism was prefigured in him. And the Father’s voice testified to the rebirth taking place [there] when he said, “This is my beloved Son, with whom I am

87 Literally, “as a child of the Father’s nature,” which is one of the regular Syriac translations of *homoousios*.

88 John 17:22.

well pleased.”⁸⁹ Once the Spirit descended, it remained upon him, just as we too would participate in this⁹⁰ in baptism. But this very thing came to him in an exceptional manner in comparison with us, since he participated in what the Son has by nature through his union with God the Word.

Fragment 28

From an Unknown Book or Section⁹¹

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> is greater than these. Along with that which indwells, the manner of indwelling is also known. It would be good for them to know that just because the term “indwelling” is common, it does not also indicate the specific manner of indwelling. Not in this instance alone do we find this to be the case. Rather, there are many things that have common names, and their specific features are known to be different. For even though the human being shares the name “living being” with the donkey, the bull, the sheep, the lion, the wolf, and the reptile, it is not the case that it actually participates with them.⁹² It appears with its own distinctive features, but the principle of the distinctive features of each of them is yet still preserved. For these have “being” and “irrational” in common, but each is separated from its neighbor in terms of the distinctive features that each of them has.

Why are these minor examples necessary for strengthening our argument, when we have a major example for the refutation of their ignorance? For they think that it is certainly possible to know what similarity everything has by means of that which is common to everything – namely, the [phrase] “it is,” which is common to God and to everything that exists. We say that God “is,” and we say everything that exists “is,” but we are not going to enumerate each one of them. Nor because God “is” are we saying that others are not. And it is not in the fact that we say “they are” as he is⁹³ <...>

89 Matt 3:17. The Greek verb *eudokē sa*, “I am well pleased,” is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

90 That is, the Spirit.

91 Though Fragments 28 and 29 have no internal indications of their original location, their contents indicate that they should be placed before Fragment 30, the ending of which indicates a recently completed discussion of the suitability of the concepts of “indwelling” and “mixture” – the subject of these two fragments.

92 That is, is simply an animal like them in all respects.

93 The lacunose nature of this fragment makes the point of this sentence unclear, though it is probably something like: “And even so [i.e. even though we say that they are], we do not say they are as he is.”

If something has a name in common with another, [that name] does not signify its distinctive features. Instead, the opposite: many things are distinct from one another in terms of nature and rank. And they are distinguished in the same way that allows a distinction between God and his creation; there is no distinction that is greater than this. They are together under a common word, but we learn their precise glory from their distinctive features. So it is too with the word “indwelling”: it is common, but each one has its own manner of indwelling; it is not the name “indwelling” that reveals equality but the species that reveals equality. The opposite is also found in questions regarding words. For when they are distinguished according to the expression “indwelling,” a simple word <...>

<...> teaches us. For our Lord commanded that when we fast, we should wash [our] faces and anoint [our] heads,⁹⁴ and to the one about to pray, he said, “Go inside and pray by yourself.”⁹⁵ And we do not see that this was taught at all by those who came before, neither to those who fasted nor to those who prayed. If this had been the custom among those who prayed, the assembly of the church would be superfluous. Furthermore, our praying all together in a group would invalidate the command “to go into your inner chamber and pray,”⁹⁶ and the command that a person should anoint his head when he fasts⁹⁷ contradicts the command, “Take nothing.”⁹⁸ For where did he get the oil from, if <...>

Fragment 29

From an Unknown Book or Section⁹⁹

(Translated from Syriac)

Now it is impossible for these natures to come to be in opposition to one another in this way. So the Lord caused the natures to be separate from one another, placing fire above in the heights and the earth below, and he enclosed the waters with sand acting like a city wall. And he separated them from each other, ordering that “the waters be gathered together into one place,”¹⁰⁰ so that the water would not mingle with the nature of earth. For [if they were mingled] they would be annulled and their natures would be obliterated by their contact in this [mixture]. [The waters] could not

94 See Matt 6:17. 95 See Matt 6:6. 96 See Matt 6:6. 97 See Matt 6:17.

98 Luke 9:3, “Take nothing for your journey, no staff, nor bag, nor bread, nor money; and do not have two tunics.”

99 See note 91 above. 100 Gen 1:9.

be received into the earth and would overrun it, since [the earth's] density would be depleted. And since [the waters] are stronger than fire, they would consume its nature, but earth would not conquer the fire in such a way that it carries it within itself <...> the earth and to allow it to germinate fruits. If the heat is strong, fruits will fail even more than dry sticks. Fruits wither from [both] hot and cold winds, since each of them has this activity, but the moisture of the winds easily rots them. Thus too if seeds are immersed in [too] much water, they fail in the ground. But if great heat is added to them, germination [happens too] rapidly, and their utility brings no benefit to the farmer, since the plant is incapable of being established in the depth, as something that rightly participates in the earth, so that it may be fixed in it. And if the cold is harsh, the generation of the seeds falters and fails. Thus, then, it is impossible for these natures to oppose one another. Previously <...>

Thus we say that heat is mixed with cold, or water with wine, and often we say that air is "mixed." When coolness is joined to heat, it mixes and the mixture becomes balanced. No one would say oil mixes with oil, or water with water, or dryness, or heat, or cold on the grounds that their activities result in different effects. So this word – "mixture" – is employed rightly. We even find that the divine scripture uses "mixture." For the blessed David said, "There is a cup in the Lord's hand, and it is full of mixed, turbid wine."¹⁰¹ In other words, it is mixed. The wise Solomon said, "Wisdom built herself a house; she has slaughtered her sacrifice; she has mixed her vessels of her wine."¹⁰² In these passages we find the word "mixture" in the scriptures.

We also use it. For how often do we use "mixture" in reference to a human being? That which has come to be from the commixture of the four elements is what constitutes the body. It is not that the earth that is in it is visible as earth, nor that the air that is known to be in it can be dissipated, nor that the water [that is in it] can flow. But when the activity of these elements [is] mixed, the constitution of the body is accomplished for us. For the effect of their activities is mixed – that is, the heat and the cold and the dryness and the moisture, according to the wisdom of their mixer. They are established for the protection of the body. And we say that the offspring of every species are established in the same way too, but these natures of

¹⁰¹ Ps 74(75):9.

¹⁰² Prov 9:1–2, with omissions.

fire and earth and air and water are not mixed. If this did not occur, the elements would disappear from them every time – [those very elements] which from part of their natures received constitution. Therefore, it is impossible for these natures to be opposed to one another because their activities are in opposition to one another. But if they are in a commixture, the result would be that they disappear <...>

Fragment 30

From Book 8, Section 62 and Book 9, Section 63

(*Translated from Syriac and Greek*)¹⁰³

Angels said to the disciples of the one who was taken up to heaven, “Galilean men, why are you standing there and gazing at heaven? This Jesus, who was taken from you up to heaven, will come in the same way that you saw him ascend to heaven.”¹⁰⁴

Greek¹⁰⁵

In every way, then, it is clear that the concept of “mixing” is terribly inappropriate and unsuitable since each of the natures remains by itself without dissolution. But it is perfectly clear that the concept of “union” is fitting, for through it, the natures are brought together to constitute one person according to the union. Accordingly, what the Lord said in reference to the man and woman – “so they are no longer two but one flesh”¹⁰⁶ – we too might also plausibly say in virtue of the principle of the union: “so they are no longer two persons but one,” of course, as long as the natures are distinguished. For just as in the former case calling them “one flesh” does not do away with their being two

Syriac

Now from all these things it is very clear that the doctrine of mixture is superfluous, neither useful nor fitting. Rather, there is a union in which the natures remain undissolved. In this [union], the natures are joined and made one person, just as our Lord said regarding husband and wife, “so they are no longer two, but one flesh.”¹⁰⁷ We have said the same thing about the doctrine of the union, that they are no longer two but one. It is clear that, though the natures are different, just as their being said to be one flesh is not at all marred by the number two – for how they are said [to be one flesh] is clear – so also here the union of the person is not corrupted by the difference between the natures. When we

¹⁰³ The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 10. Where the original Greek is extant, it is placed to the left of the Syriac. Another fragment preserves a different Syriac translation of the same material; this parallel appears in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

¹⁰⁴ Acts 1:11. ¹⁰⁵ This is the Greek of LT6. ¹⁰⁶ Matt 19:6.

¹⁰⁷ Matt 19:6. See Origen’s similar Christological use of this same verse in *On First Principles* 2.6, translated in this volume on p. 192.

Greek

in number – for it is perfectly clear in what respect they are called “one” – so too in the latter case the union of the person does not do away with the distinctiveness of the natures. For when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of God the Word is complete and his person is complete (for it’s impossible to speak of a hypostasis without a person), and moreover that the nature of the human being is complete and his person likewise. But when we turn our attention to the conjunction, then we say there is one person.

Syriac

consider the natures, we perceive the divine nature in its hypostasis and the human nature. When we observe the conjunction, we say one person and one hypostasis.

Syriac¹⁰⁸

Also in the case of the human being: when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of the soul is one thing, and that of the body another – a single hypostasis of the one and a single [hypostasis] of the other. Thus we know they are different, namely, when the soul is distant from the body, it is its own dwelling¹⁰⁹ and exists in its own person. Therefore, each one of them is spoken of in its own person, in accordance with the doctrine of the nature. In fact, this is also the case with “the inner human being” and “the outer human being,” as designated by Paul: each one is worthy of the name of the common whole. It is obvious, though, that with the addition of the “inner” and the “outer,” he does not understand the whole together by a loose phrase or by a diminution of the name, inasmuch as he joins that which is said to the two of them together.¹¹⁰

Syriac

For just as when we distinguish the nature of the human being, we say the nature of the soul is one thing and that of the body another, recognizing that each of them has a hypostasis and nature, and just as we are convinced that, when the soul is separated from the body, it abides in its nature and in its hypostasis and each of them has a nature and hypostasis, so also do we learn from the Apostle that the same [applies] to the inner human being and the outer human being. We name their oneness by something common [to both], then add “inner” and “outer,” so as not to name them simply with a phrase. For as we say about them that they are conjoined in one hypostasis and one person, we designate the two in one.

108 This is the Syriac of BT 17b. 109 Literally, “place.”

110 That is, when one specifies “inner” or “outer,” one seems to limit the thing being referred to, but Theodore wants to make the point that having a phrase like “the inner human being” does not void the larger category “human being.”

Greek¹¹¹

In the same way also in this case, we say that the substance of God the Word is his own and that of the human being is his own. For the natures are distinguished, but one person is constituted by the union. Thus, in this case, when we attempt to distinguish the natures, we say that the person of the human being is complete and that of the divinity is complete, but when we focus our attention on the union, we proclaim that both the natures conjointly are one person, with the humanity receiving honor from [all] creation by the divinity and the divinity accomplishing all that is right in the humanity.

Syriac

In the same way also in this case we say that there is a divine nature and a human nature. And while we recognize the natures, there is one person of the union. And thus, when we wish to perceive the natures, we say that the human being is complete in his hypostasis. We also say that the divinity is complete. For what unity do we wish to perceive? We proclaim one person and one hypostasis for the two natures. As we know, humanity receives honor from creation because of the union with divinity and divinity performs all things in it.

The Beginning of Book Nine¹¹²

63. How the heretics use “the Word became flesh”¹¹³ against us.¹¹⁴

64. How the heretics use “he took the form of a slave”¹¹⁵ against us.

65. That it is impossible, according to the doctrine of the heretics, for God the Word with a human body to be called a human being.

Book Nine

In what we have already said, we have shown the might and magnitude of the church’s teaching. We sufficiently demonstrated from the words of scripture we previously rehearsed that “indwelling” is fittingly said, and we demonstrated from the scriptures that we rightly employ the word “union” and abstain from the word “mixture.” Although we have already addressed our position on these things well, we should not allow whatever they put forward to abolish the two of them.¹¹⁶

They say they have two firm witnesses that suffice to establish their novel fables. Here they are: from the evangelist, “the Word became flesh,”¹¹⁷ and from the Apostle, “he emptied himself and took the form of a slave.”¹¹⁸ Oh, what an abundance of folly! How do they not realize that what seems

111 This is the Greek of LT7.

112 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

113 John 1:14. 114 Book 9 begins with a list of the sections it contains.

115 Phil 2:7. 116 That is, the words “indwelling” and “union.”

117 John 1:14. 118 Phil 2:7.

agreeable to them, which they often repeat, actually opposes them? How can “became flesh” be similar to “he took the form of a slave”? For that’s how these passages would have to be understood according to their opinion. It is clear that something that is “becoming” is not anything else alongside what it “became” but it is whatever it is said to be “becoming,” since it is known that that which is “becoming” in the hypostasis has “become.” But the one that takes is said to be something else beyond what it takes, just as God in this way fashioned the body from <...>

Fragment 31

From an Unknown Book or Section¹¹⁹

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> himself. “Look, I have *become* a fool, because you have forced me [to it].”¹²⁰ It is not we who say that the Apostle was a fool, but this was said by him because of the boasting of those who are ignorant of the purpose of boasting. He did not say it so that he might engage in boasting himself, but in order to abolish boasters.

On the topic of Christ, [he said], “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by *becoming* a curse for us, as [is written], ‘Cursed is he who by decree of the law is hung on the tree.’”¹²¹ Since he accepted that he would be hung on a tree, our Lord is said to have become a curse – not as if he is changed into a curse, but [that he is changed] in the estimation of others. For the Apostle said, “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law and *became* a curse for us,” and after that, he quotes, “It is written that ‘cursed is everyone that is hung from a tree.’” Thus he was a “curse” in the estimation of others because he accepted the punishment which the law stipulated for debtors – death – so that by [doing so] he might dissolve the curses upon us. He was estimated as a curse by those who failed to grasp the greatness of the [divine] economy and by the sinful Jews.

119 Though Fragment 31 has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – a discussion of the word “became” from John 1:14 – indicate that it should be placed after Fragment 30, which introduces the discussion of John 1:14, and before Fragment 32, which sums up a previous discussion of John 1:14.

120 2 Cor 12:11. In this fragment, Theodore discusses several scriptural passages which in Greek contain some form of the verb *ginomai*, which appears in John 1:14 as *egeneto* (“became”). Here the forms of this verb are italicized for clarity, even if they cannot always be translated with some form of “become.”

121 Gal 3:13, quoting Deut 21:23.

According to the meaning¹²² which is in the passage where Joshua the son of Nun says to his warriors, “Look, you will surround the city, and do not *be* very far from the city”¹²³ – for they were not surrounding it¹²⁴ and were very far from it – it is in this sense, then, that the Apostle said about our Lord, that “he *came to be* in the likeness of a human being.”¹²⁵ For it was in the meaning when it was said that “he dwelled with the saints,” as if [to say] “he was among them in love” and he was not very far [from them] in nature.

[“Became” is also used] in reference to the receiving of children, as when it says, “Abraham was one hundred years old when Isaac *became* his son.”¹²⁶ It is used in reference to the acquisition of wealth, as when it is said about Isaac, that “there *came* to him bulls and sheep and many workers.”¹²⁷ It is used in reference to equality in honor, as in what was said about him, “The Lord blessed him, and the man grew rich and he continued to become strong until he *became* very great.”¹²⁸ And it is used in reference to health, as when it said that “it *became* a corrupter of the flesh.”¹²⁹

So then, this [word], “became,” has been used in many ways in the scriptures. It is also used in many ways according to our customary way of speaking. At times it is used in reference to activities, at times in reference to passive experiences. It is used in reference to changes in activity and in ways of thinking. And even now it is used as something thought by those who do not adhere to the truth of the literal [interpretation], as a [signal] for meaning. It is said in reference to the assumption <...> or in reference to the acquisition <...> or <...>.

It is also said in reference to the hypostasis, and thus many come to an accurate understanding of it. For by “hypostasis” is implied the two persons, whether they are as they were from the beginning or as [they have been] changed into other things. [It is used] in reference to activity, as when it is said, “The Lord *became* my helper and place of refuge and my salvation.”¹³⁰ And in another place, “The Lord *became* for me a place of refuge and my God a helper”¹³¹ – God has become a helper and Savior, not by changing, but by pitying and helping. This is something literal. Thus also in the Acts of the Apostles the blessed Peter said, “Men and brothers, it was fitting

122 Alternatively, “the understanding.” 123 Josh 8:4.

124 Literally, “they were at a distance [from it].” 125 Phil 2:7.

126 Gen 21:5. 127 Gen 26:14. 128 Gen 26:12–13.

129 Citation unknown. 130 Ps 7:2. 131 Ps 93(94):22.

that the scripture be fulfilled, which the Spirit spoke beforehand through the mouth of David about Judas, who *became* the guide of those traitors.”¹³² This is said literally because he literally became a leader.

“Became” is also said in reference to passive experiences, “I have *become* like a deaf man in whose mouth there is no admonition.”¹³³ And also, “I have *become* a byword to them.”¹³⁴ It is not that there was an actual change into a deaf person but that as a result of much adversity he now became like one who was deaf. Thus, because of the many adversities of his passion it is said that he was like a deaf man.

[“Became” is also said] in reference to a change in activity or in ways of thinking, as when it says about the Messiah that “he *came to be* under the law so that he might redeem those who were under the law.”¹³⁵ It is said that “he *came to be* under the law” because it dictated his conduct, and he fulfilled everything in his life on its behalf. And again, “*Become* imitators of me.”¹³⁶ And it is clear that this also refers to a change in lifestyle, as is thought by many in accordance with the non-literal interpretation. As for what he says about <...>

Fragment 32

From Book 9

(Translated from Greek)

In these circumstances, then,¹³⁷ we have found that “he became” cannot have been said in any other way than in the sense of “he appeared.” In our statements above we taught that it is quite precisely this very thing that is said in the divine scripture and by others especially in regard to the Lord. For “the Word became flesh”¹³⁸ [means] he appeared, but appeared not in the sense that he did not take real flesh but in the sense that he did not become [real flesh]. For when he¹³⁹ says, “he took,”¹⁴⁰ he says it not in the sense that he [only] appeared [to take flesh] but in the sense that he really [took flesh]. But when [he¹⁴¹ says] “he became,” then [he says it] in the sense that “he appeared.” For he was not changed into flesh. So then, one must

132 Acts 1:16. 133 Ps 37(38):14. 134 Ps 68(69):12. 135 1 Cor 9:20.

136 1 Cor 11:1.

137 Reading *toinun* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *toinēn*.

138 John 1:14. 139 That is, Paul. 140 Phil 2:7.

141 That is, the author of the Gospel of John.

attend to the evangelist's meaning, for in this way shall we understand the meaning of his words.

Fragment 33

From Book 9

(Translated from Latin)

In any case, if the statement, "The Word became flesh," is said in a way indicating some alteration, how ought "he indwelt"¹⁴² be understood? For it is obvious to everyone that what indwells is different from what is indwelt. For "he indwelt among us" when he assumed our nature and dwelt [in it] and arranged in it all things for our salvation. Therefore, how did the Word of God become flesh by indwelling? It is obvious that he was neither altered nor transformed, for then he could not be said to indwell.

Fragment 34

From Book 9

(Translated from Greek)

For what is said in our case in relation to our spatial disposition [is said] in God's case in relation to the disposition of his will.¹⁴³ After all, just as in our case we say, "I came to be in this place," so too in God's case [we say], "He came to be in this [place]." For what movement enacts in our case, willing does in God's case, since by nature he is present everywhere.

Fragment 35

From Section 66

(Translated from Syriac)

So, both from the testimonies they advanced and from the things said afterward, it is demonstrated that the human being, God the Word enfleshed, cannot be honored except if the human being is a living thing like this <...>

142 John 1:14. The verb in Latin is *inhabitavit*, which is normally translated, "he dwelt." But in order to bring out Theodore's point, a translation that highlights the *in* prefix is needed.

143 In Greek *kata tēn [schēsin] tēs gnōmēs*, which in the Latin of Fragment 69 is translated *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

Fragment 36

From Section 66

(Translated from Syriac)

Therefore, they are guilty on every count of talking very foolishly, since God the Word enfleshed is not known by the title of “human being.” Obviously, when scripture mentions the title “human being” with respect to Christ, it always indicates the nature of the human being, which was assumed complete by him for our salvation. It is that one which scripture customarily calls by this title.

Fragment 37

From Book 10, Section 70

(Translated from Latin)

For just as we are taught the difference between natures by such words from the divine scripture, so too we declare the union as often as [scripture] combines the properties of both natures into one thing and so speaks of one particular thing. For this is to show both the different natures and the union of the person simultaneously: from the difference between the things said, the difference between natures is understood, but when they are connected in one thing, we recognize the clear union. And so, the blessed evangelist John said, “The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him and said, ‘Behold, the Lamb of God! Behold, the one who takes away the sins of the world. This is the one of whom I said, “After me comes a man who ranks before me, because he was before me and I did not know him.”’”¹⁴⁴ For in saying this – “He saw Jesus coming toward him and said, ‘Behold, the Lamb of God!’” – it seems to me that he clearly signifies the humanity. For that which John the Baptist saw was that which underwent death, namely, the body that was offered for the whole world. But what follows – “the one who takes away the sins of the world” – is surely not in any way applicable to the flesh. For it was not the work of the flesh to take away the sin of the whole world, but this was unquestionably the work of the divinity.

¹⁴⁴ John 1:29–30.

Fragment 38

From Book 10

(Translated from Greek)

“Then an angel from heaven appeared to him, giving him strength. And being in agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like drops of blood falling down upon the ground.”¹⁴⁵ We learn from these words, then, that Christ clearly endured the agony and no ordinary one at that.

Fragment 39

From Book 10

(Translated from Greek)

What sort of coherence is there between the phrases “the one who descended from heaven” and “the one who is in heaven”?¹⁴⁶ For the one eliminates the other: “descending from heaven” by “being in heaven” and “being” by “descending.” But he “descended” by indwelling in the human being, whereas he “is in heaven” by being present to all through the limitlessness of his nature.

Fragment 40

From an Unknown Book or Section¹⁴⁷

(Translated from Syriac)

<...> that are said. As the Apostle also said, “We speak the wisdom of God in secret, that which was hidden, which God first set apart before the foundations of the world for our glory. None of the rulers of this world knew it, for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, ‘no eye had seen, nor ear heard, nor had it arisen in a human heart what God has prepared for those who love him.’”¹⁴⁸ This glory in the human being, which is superior to and has surpassed the entire human nature, was revealed to them. They did not acquire accurate

¹⁴⁵ Luke 22:43–44.

¹⁴⁶ John 3:13.

¹⁴⁷ Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – an interpretation of Ps 8:1–3 – indicate that it is connected with Fragment 41, which interprets Ps 8:5–7 and should be placed before it.

¹⁴⁸ 1 Cor 2:7–9.

knowledge of him, something that we see even the apostles acquired at the end. It was important at that time that thenceforth the nature of the human being be revealed – but it was not possible for it to come forth, because of the profundity of the things that were spoken of among others. He recalled the greatness of glory; he was at that time silent about those things that were superior to the nature. And he rehearsed while speaking humbly about him, “You have made him a little lower than [the angels]”¹⁴⁹ <...> so that those, insofar as they were able, might at that time receive what was said, but those who came afterwards, after advancing to the limit of things that pertain to knowledge, would receive the truth from the miracles that were performed at that time and from the testimonies that were spoken beforehand, since these last activities would give them accurate knowledge.

But why am I saying these things when it is easy for us to make our demonstrations from scripture as we promised? The sense of the psalm is clear to everyone: it is right for us to reflect on its first words in reference to the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, namely, “Lord, our Lord, how glorious is your name in all the earth?,” and, “Your glory is higher than the heavens,” and, “From the mouth of the child you have established your glory,” and, “I see your heavens, the work of your hands,” and, “the moon and the stars which you established.”¹⁵⁰ And it is clear that we learn from our Lord [as well], as the book of blessed Matthew the evangelist has transmitted to us. For it narrated how in accordance with the word of prophecy the Lord sat upon the ass¹⁵¹ and entered the city, and how <...>

Fragment 41

From Book 10

(Translated from Latin and Greek)

“What¹⁵² is the human being that you keep him in mind, or the Son of Man that you visit him?”¹⁵³ So¹⁵⁴ let us investigate who the human being is about whom the prophet is amazed and astonished, that the Only-Begotten

149 Ps 8:6; Heb 2:7. 150 Ps 8:1–3.

151 Matt 21:5, alluding to Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9.

152 The translation begins with the Latin. 153 Ps 8:5.

154 The translation switches to the Greek here.

should deign to keep him in mind and make a visitation. But that this is not said <about every human being> has been shown in the remarks above. That it is not about just one random individual – this too is quite clear. So let us put aside everything, let us accept the apostolic testimony, which is most trustworthy of all. For¹⁵⁵ when the Apostle writes to the Hebrews, he tells them about Christ and confirms his person, which was not acceptable to them, saying, “It has been testified somewhere, ‘What is the human being that you keep him in mind, or the Son of Man that you visit him? You have made him a little less than the angels; with glory and honor you have crowned him and set him over the works of your hands; you have subjected all things under his feet.’”¹⁵⁶ And after quoting this testimony he added an interpretation of it, “Now by putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing that was not subjected. But now we do not yet see everything subjected to him.”¹⁵⁷ And then he teaches us who the human being is, since doubt was voiced about this by the blessed David, adding, “But we see Jesus made a little less than the angels, crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death.”¹⁵⁸ Therefore, if we have learned from the gospels that it was in reference to the Lord that the blessed David spoke everything in this psalm – “you keep in mind” and “you visit” and “you have made less” and “you have subjected” and the rest – and if we are taught by the Apostle that it is Jesus of whom David was speaking when he said that he kept him in mind and visited him, and also that he subjected everything to him, when he made him a little less than the angels, then it is high time to put aside your shamelessness, even if it is difficult, in full awareness of what is proper. For you see, you who are most wicked of all human beings, how great the difference between the natures is, because there was amazement over [the Only-Begotten] deigning to keep the human being in mind, to visit him, and to make him share in the rest of the things in which he made him share, while on the contrary there was astonishment over [the human being] meriting to share in such great things surpassing his nature. The former is marveled at because he gives a promotion and bestows great things that surpass the nature of one who obtained the promotion, whereas the other is marveled at because he obtains the promotion and receives from him things that are greater than he deserves.

155 The translation returns to the Latin here.

156 Heb 2:6–8, quoting Ps 8:5–7.

157 Heb 2:8. 158 Heb 2:9.

Fragment 42
From Books 10 and 11
(*Translated from Syriac*)

And some things are applied to the two – some chrysolite and some fire. From Isaiah, “garments worn” and “reddened by the blood of [our] enemies.”¹⁵⁹ And it is at another point, when he is in a human body and sitting on the throne, that he is surrounded by seraphim.¹⁶⁰ Forced, then, by such sights we might go as far as to think that they did not have human bodies, but rather were novel [bodies] created by uncommon means, since they have wings and feathers on the wings. And we say that the body that was assumed by God the Father is one thing, that assumed by the Son is another, and both are different and separate from the angels, because in fact, to Balaam he appeared as a human being, a sword clasped in his hand,¹⁶¹ and to Joshua he appeared in the form of someone armed.¹⁶² Lest we put forward too many words about these things, let us just say, “many bodies,” if we are led along by such visions to think they are accurate. But if this is not possible (that these visions appear for the sake of their utility, to aid those who see them), it is clear that even Abraham received a vision that appeared to him suitably from God <...>

*The End of Book Ten.*¹⁶³

The Sections of Book Eleven

Those who ask, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one who conferred a benefit or the one who received a benefit?”

Those who say, “It is obvious that our Lord [does] not [have] a soul, and he comes to us in the mysteries [as] body and blood.”¹⁶⁴

<...>

<...> that the words he prepared

<...> that are said now

<...> the division of the natures, the union of the person; rightfully in these things

<...> said above.

We have employed sufficient proofs about the soul and the mind to confirm the truth of the required things. Here, we seek to demonstrate

159 Isa 63:1. 160 Isa 6:1–3. 161 Num 22:23. 162 Josh 5:13.

163 Italicized rubrics in this translation are part of the fragment.

164 The remainder of the section titles are quite fragmentary.

this alone, but we will also demonstrate something more: that we learn from the scriptures not merely the difference between the natures, but also the sign of the body and the rational soul, from which it is manifest that he is a complete human being. As a consequence, let us grasp on to what the orderly arrangement of the doctrine demands. These people raise many different questions to us to [try to] nullify the truth. Sometimes they say, "If we say [there are] two complete, then we must say two sons." And at other times, "It is not right to say one and the other." And also, "It is right to say that God the Word was crucified, for he is the Messiah and not something else." We have fittingly responded to such questions and promised to make known the truth of the church by an exposition. Because we did not lie with our promise, we have replied to the question in full, and we are compelled to do so with the words spoken in the accurate testimonies. First of all <...>

Fragment 43
From Book 11, Section 73
(*Translated from Syriac*)¹⁶⁵

Did he assume, or was he assumed? Is he the form of God or the form of the human being? Do you not say it was the form of God that assumed, but the form of the slave that was assumed? Why do you need the artifice of asking questions now, and why don't you draw their distinction from the divine scriptures and impress knowledge of the fear of God on your pure minds? In what way is he who assumed similar to that which was assumed? Or what equality is there between God and the human being? Or between the slave and the Lord? Between the form of God and the form of the slave? See how greatly he has demonstrated to us the distinction between the natures, calling the one "the form of the slave" and the other "[the form] of God,"¹⁶⁶ the one who assumed and the one who was assumed. He put these distinctions together in one place and made us understand the union of the person. For he said, "Rather, he emptied himself and took the form of a slave, and came to be in the likeness of human beings."¹⁶⁷

165 The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 12–13. Two fragments preserve a different Syriac translation of the same material; these parallels appear in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

166 See Phil 2:6–7. 167 Phil 2:7.

And after mentioning his corporeality,¹⁶⁸ he turned toward the humanity, making known by his revelation its conjunction with God the Word. For he says, “He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross.”¹⁶⁹ And clearly these things correspond to the nature of the human being, who was fastened with nails to the cross and accepted death according to his nature. What indicates the conjunction was the fact that he “humbled himself,” not that he was human when he accepted death for himself. He who endured the decree of God upon his nature from the beginning¹⁷⁰ “humbled himself and became obedient unto death, and all the more [death] on a cross.”¹⁷¹ This is the one who was assumed by God the Word. And he became capable of overcoming death because of his conjunction. By his will, on behalf of our salvation, he endured suffering and he continued to speak things that are fitting and appropriate for human nature. In connection with these things, he said, “Because of this God highly exalted him and gave him the name above every name.”¹⁷² And what do we say was exalted? God the Word? If so, how did the one who was the form of God, the likeness of God, accept being taken up to the heights? For it is not possible that this was a kind of “participation” by theft; rather, it must be something that was appropriate to his nature, even though he knew full well that he was equal with his Father, and even though he was well pleased in his will that his glory be hidden and that he appear in the form of a slave for our salvation. This is what Paul said about him; is there anything greater than what has been said? He accepted [death] and was exalted. Otherwise, how did God elevate one who was equal to himself – or indeed one who made himself greater than God? It is vile to say this, but it is required if they are equal. When one remains within [a certain] measure, but the other is elevated beyond that measure of equality, then equality goes away. In this case, then, it is clear that he would be great [and] would have had actual equality from the start. And how, among these equals, is one able to give grace and the other to need it? And what [could be] given to him? In fact, we also see this: it says “the name.” And what is that [name]? “At the name of Jesus, every knee will bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God his Father.”¹⁷³ And [on their view] the Maker of

168 Presumably a reference to verse just quoted, Phil 2:7. 169 Phil 2:8.

170 A reference to punishment given to Adam and Eve in Gen 3.

171 Phil 2:8. 172 Phil 2:9. 173 Phil 2:10.

all received this grace [of the name] after death, even though by his hand everything was created and without him nothing of what exists would have even been established.¹⁷⁴

For if someone says that this [name] was granted to him, that is, to God the Word, as many have wickedly said, they have turned to something other than knowledge of the truth and worshiped it. And [if this is true] it is clear that even the Father received this grace [of the name]. There were many who spoke wickedly in this way, but after the coming of Christ they turned to knowledge. However, according to their doctrine, it is right to say precisely the Father received the grace [of the name] all the more. For he who in the coming and in his suffering made it so that every person might be brought to knowledge of the Father, namely

Syriac¹⁷⁵

Now, our Lord himself said, “I have made your name known to humanity.”¹⁷⁶ It is obvious, then, that he said these [words] about the one who was assumed, the one who was glorified by all creation and [received] the confession of [his] lordship and veneration from all, “from those in heaven, those on earth, and those under the entire earth.”¹⁷⁷ For this is the grace that the one who was assumed has taken up.

Syriac

our Lord, said to his Father, “I will make your name known among human beings.”¹⁷⁸ It is clear then that these things were said about the one who was assumed, the one to whom glory was given from all creation, and the confession of [his] lordship and worship “from all in heaven and earth and under the earth.”¹⁷⁹ It was he who was assumed that assumed this grace, not while he was simple and by himself but in union with God the Word.

For every glory is owed to the only-begotten God the Word from his creation, because all came into being through him. Those who offer worship to this one, even though they know that the form of the slave who was assumed is one with him, when they give glory also worship the form of the slave that was assumed, being aware of the union of the form of the slave with God the Word. So if anyone wants to say “God” about God the Word as the one who exalted him, it seems to me that he has spoken well. And this understanding is fitting also for the doctrine of the Word. For he assumed the form of a slave and in his union with him he exalted and elevated him, and allowed him to be worshiped by all creation. So then, where do we go

174 See John 1:3. 175 This is the Syriac of BT20. 176 John 17:6.
177 Phil 2:10. 178 John 17:6. 179 Phil 2:10.

from here? Did he assume, or was he assumed? Is he the form of God or the form of a slave? Is he the Maker of all, or has he received worship by grace? May every blaspheming tongue be silent! Let the blessed Apostle teach us, clearly, what the distinction between the natures is, and what the glory of the nature that assumed is, and whether he is the one who was assumed, and whether this one is the form of God and that one is the form of a slave, and how he allowed himself in his mercy to be brought down from his glory. By grace he was assumed by him and by grace he is worshiped by all creation.

And [the Apostle] adds to those things while teaching us about the union. He teaches this by gathering [the phrases] together in one place. For while he spoke about God the Word, [saying] that “he who was in the form of God”¹⁸⁰ and the rest, and that “he came to be in the likeness of human beings and was found in the form of the human being,”¹⁸¹ he also added that “he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross”¹⁸² – which was a demonstration of humanity. He also said, “because of this God exalted him,”¹⁸³ and all those things that he thereafter also said about him. It appears that they were opposed, but I am amazed at the accuracy of the words of the Apostle, that first he said about him that he assumed and then about the other that he was assumed. He called the former the form of God and the latter the form of the slave. And after he distinguished the natures accurately, then he mentioned also his corporeality and death on a cross, and also the things that happened to him after death – namely, the glory he received from all creation – and in all these things he makes the union apparent. For in that assumption [there was] that which assumed and that which was assumed. And by the fact that the former was the form of God and the latter the form of the slave we distinguish the natures, but we understand the union of the person by the glory that makes God the Word participate in death and in the cross. But they do not want to give any heed to the things that were said, and they scorn learning the truth from the scriptures,

Syriac¹⁸⁴

So sometimes they ask, “Is he one thing and another thing, or is he one and the same?” and sometimes, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved, the one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?”

Syriac

so they sometimes ask, “Is he one thing and another thing? Or is he [one and] the same?” And also, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? Is he the one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?”

180 Phil 2:6. 181 Phil 2:7. 182 Phil 2:8. 183 Phil 2:9.

184 This is the Syriac of BT 21.

Latin

What we have said in regard to such [questions] is indeed sufficient, where we showed both the difference between the natures and the union of the person, and that with respect to the natures, this one received a benefit, but the other conferred a benefit, since there is a firm union that results in honor or being paid inseparably by the whole creation.

Syriac¹⁸⁵

What we have already said about such questions is sufficient: we showed both the difference between the natures and the union of the person. And with respect to the natures, this one received a benefit, but the other was found to confer a benefit, since there is an obvious union that results in honor [being paid] inseparably from all completed creation.

Syriac

For these things that have been said are sufficient, in which we showed the difference between the natures and the union of the person. And it is manifest in terms of nature that the one received a benefit and the other conferred a benefit, since there is an obvious union of the two of them that results in worship being received from the whole creation.

Let us demonstrate this even more accurately from the words of the blessed David. For Paul witnesses to those things that were said or were explained by him and which were taken up by our Lord and by the apostles. In fact, they are from the Lord since he is the one who was speaking in the Apostle. The blessed David saw first in the grace of the Holy Spirit the whole economy that was going to happen, that God the Creator of all would be willing to dwell in a human being for our salvation, and to assume the form of a slave, and to make it one with him and let [this form] rule in union with him over all. He wondered at his mercy and was amazed by the magnitude of the glory of human beings, that [God] made us worthy of this glory, so that he might dwell in our nature. He knew this beforehand by the revelation of the Spirit, so that all people might be aware of God the Creator of all, and that in creation his name might be praised and everyone might know his Maker, who was not known to them before. He marveled about these two as one: first, about the fact that [God] would turn those inclined to evil to the good, and second, that he would perform this activity in a human being as if in a vessel, which he assumed as though the first from our race, and he prepared everything in him for the salvation of our lives, and that there be subjected to him <...>

185 This is the Syriac of BT21.

Fragment 44

From an Unknown Book or Section¹⁸⁶*(Translated from Syriac)*

<...> that it might be useful for the distinction between the natures. They ask us, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?” And they continue on, putting this bitter and scheming question to those who are upright, having no care for what might be agreeable and suitable for the teachings of the church. Therefore, it is right to demonstrate these things from the divine scripture, even if it was already possible to demonstrate [them] from what was mentioned above. Different properties necessarily follow from different natures. When they want to inquire rationally into the natures, it is because of their stubborn disbelief; they ask unusual questions so as to propound novelties.

So let us add this: it is quite obvious that one conferred a benefit and the other received a benefit. We have already learned this from the gospel. For when our Lord came to Jerusalem and started to drive out from the temple those selling doves and sheep, he said to them, “This house is for prayer and not to be set up for business.”¹⁸⁷ And they asked him for a sign, that he might demonstrate his greatness and thereby confirm that he could order the long-held custom to be stopped. But he did not show them this sign. Instead, he said to them, “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up”¹⁸⁸ – in explanation of this the evangelist said, “He was talking about the temple of his body.”¹⁸⁹ They continue on and say to us (for it is lovely to use their own words against them), “Is he the one who raises or the one who is raised? Is he the one who raises the one who was destroyed, or is he the one who receives the destruction?” Now these in fact do not fit with one another. For the one who is destroyed needs the one who raises him, who is beyond suffering and by his authority raises the one who is destroyed. Tell us then! What is right to say regarding this question? But we respond very easily and say we have sufficient knowledge

¹⁸⁶ Though this fragment has no internal indications of its original location, its contents – a discussion of the questions, “Is he the one saving or the one being saved? The one conferring a benefit or the one receiving a benefit?” – indicate that it is connected with the similar discussion in Fragment 43, and should be placed before Fragment 45, which sums up the discussion of these questions.

¹⁸⁷ See John 2:13–16. ¹⁸⁸ John 2:19. ¹⁸⁹ John 2:21.

of this from scripture. One is destroyed, the other raises. One is the temple that receives destruction; the other is the one who raises it, namely God the Word, who promised to raise his destroyed temple. How do they fail to learn the distinction between the natures from these things, and [arrive at] the knowledge of the truth? Instead they launch assaults with crafty questions to confuse the simple.

Fragment 45

From Section 73

(Translated from Syriac)

So as not to drag out the discussion too long, these topics – the natures and the subject of our demonstration, namely, that it is clearly shown from the divine scriptures that one confers a benefit and the other receives a benefit – have been covered sufficiently.

Fragment 46

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

And now because of this, we must move on from these matters. For it will be demonstrated, with God's assistance, that the human being who was assumed is something other in nature than God the Word, as has been shown to us by the things said explicitly.

Fragment 47

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

For this reason he did not say, "He has spoken to us in *the* Son," but "in a Son."¹⁹⁰ Since this is said without qualification, it can signify both by the same [wording]: it principally signifies the true Son (and by "true Son" I mean the one who acquired sonship through a natural begetting) and secondarily along with this it also allows in its meaning the one who truly participates in the dignity [of sonship] through his union with him.¹⁹¹

¹⁹⁰ Heb 1:2.

¹⁹¹ That is, with the true Son.

Fragment 48

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

At long last, then, will they end this shameful wrangling and abandon¹⁹² this pointless quarrel, respecting the obvious meaning of the words? For he says, “bringing many sons to glory.”¹⁹³ See, then, it is clear that the Apostle includes the assumed human being among the “many” in the category of sonship: he does not participate in sonship in a similar manner as them, but in a similar manner nonetheless, in that he received sonship by grace since divinity alone possesses natural sonship.¹⁹⁴ Now this much is perfectly clear, that the exceptional status of sonship is peculiar to him¹⁹⁵ in comparison to the rest of human beings, through his union with him.¹⁹⁶ Accordingly, he is conceptually understood to be included in the term “Son.” But they concoct the argument against us that if we speak of two complete things, we will surely also be speaking of two sons. But note that in scripture “son” is mentioned by itself, with no reference to the divinity, when he is being classified with the rest of human beings, and we do not actually speak of two sons. The Son is rightly confessed to be one, since the difference between the natures ought necessarily to remain and the union of the person be preserved indivisible. And when he says, “bringing many sons to glory,” he adds, “to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”¹⁹⁷ See how clearly he says that God the Word perfected the assumed human being “through sufferings,” whom he also called “the pioneer of salvation” because he was the first to be deemed worthy of this and became the cause [of this] for others.

192 Reading *apostēsontai* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *apostēsonta*.

193 Heb 2:10.

194 The insertions and omissions to this sentence suggested by Behr, Jansen, and Daley seem unnecessary, as sense can be made of the passage without them.

195 The Greek here is *tēs huiotētos autō ... prosesti to exaireton*. The ancient Latin translation of this fragment goes as follows: *filiationis gloria ... inest ei praecipue*. The difference is perhaps indicative of a corruption in the Greek as we have it. This led Jansen to conjecturally prefix <*hē doxa*> to these words. The Latin version translated would be: “Now this much is perfectly clear, that the glory of sonship is peculiar to him in an exceptional manner in comparison to the rest of human beings, through the union with him.”

196 That is, with the Word. 197 Heb 2:10.

Fragment 49

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

For according to our interpretation, they continue to apply the name “son” to all who are such. For since what has been said reflects a more human way of speaking, they thought that it was right to use this term, which also happened to be his title, and that the name “Jesus” was the proper name of the one assumed, as “Peter” and “Paul” (or whatsoever one is mentioned) is that of the apostles, and he was called this [name] after his birth from Mary.

Fragment 50

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

But in response to this they say that the name “Jesus” means “Savior.” So how, they say, might a human being be called “Savior”? They have forgotten that the son of Nun was also called “Jesus.”¹⁹⁸ And the truly amazing thing is that he was not called this through some chance turn of events at his birth, but rather he had his name changed by Moses.¹⁹⁹ Now it is clear that he would not have tolerated this [name] being giving to²⁰⁰ a human being if it were really indicative of the divine nature in every case.

Fragment 51

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek and Latin)

“In²⁰¹ many and various ways long ago God spoke to the fathers in the prophets, but in these last²⁰² days he has spoken to us in a Son.”²⁰³ For here it is clearly indicated that by “in a Son” he means “in the human being.” “For²⁰⁴ to which of the angels did he ever say, ‘You are my Son, today I have begotten you?’”²⁰⁵ He is saying that he made none of the angels a sharer in the dignity of the Son. When he said, “I have begotten you,” as if thereby

198 That is, Joshua. 199 See Num 13:16.

200 Reading *ep'* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *ap'*.

201 The translation begins with the Greek.

202 Reading *eschatōn* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr's *eschatou*.

203 Heb 1:2. 204 Here the translation switches to the Latin.

205 Heb 1:5, quoting Ps 2:7.

bestowing a share in sonship, it is entirely and explicitly clear that what was said has nothing to do with God the Word.

Fragment 52

From Book 12

(Translated from Latin)

In response to this, however, the blessed Apostle tries to show how he²⁰⁶ is a sharer in divine honor and that he enjoys this, not because of his own nature, but because of the indwelling power.

Fragment 53

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

Accordingly, [Paul] not only calls [Jesus] “Son” to distinguish him from God the Word, but he is also proven to be classifying him in the category of sonship along with the rest of those who participate in sonship. For he participates in sonship by grace, having not been begotten naturally from the Father, even though he has a preeminence in comparison to the rest because he has come to possess sonship through his union with him, which fact graces him with a more authoritative share in the reality.

Fragment 54

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

“And you will call his name Jesus. He will be great and will be called Son of the Most High.”²⁰⁷ See, then, how when [Gabriel] announces the good news of the birth from Mary (I mean the one according to the flesh), he orders that he be called “Jesus” but foretells that he will be called “Son of the Most High.” It makes sense that he orders the former to be given as the proper name of the one being born but foretells that he will be called the latter, since the name was a symbol of the honor which eventually his share in the reality would confirm.

²⁰⁶ That is, Jesus. ²⁰⁷ Luke 1:31–32.

Fragment 55

From Book 12

(Translated from Greek)

It is clear that in making a distinction between the natures we must never lose sight of the fact that God the Word is said to be Son because of his natural begetting [from the Father] and the human being enjoys²⁰⁸ the dignity of the Son, being much greater than what he is in himself, through his conjunction with him.

Fragment 56

From Book 12

(Translated from Latin)

But if someone should want to ask what I would say Jesus Christ is, I say that he is God and Son of God.

Fragment 57

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

“It is fitting that he through whom and for whom all things [exist]” – obviously, this refers to God the Word – “in bringing many children to glory” – he means those worthy of adoption as children – “should perfect the pioneer of their salvation through suffering” – [this refers] to the human being who was assumed by him.²⁰⁹

Fragment 58

From Section 77

(Translated from Syriac)

Therefore, on the basis of these things it has also been demonstrated sufficiently that the human being assumed by God the Word is said to be “Son of God” because of him and in relation to him.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ Reading *apolauei* with Jansen and Daley instead of Behr’s *apolauein*.

²⁰⁹ Heb 2:10. ²¹⁰ That is, God the Word.

Fragment 59

From Sections 77–78

*(Translated from Syriac, Latin, and Greek)*²¹¹

<...> he did this. For it is also fitting that it was said, “of the Holy Spirit,”²¹² but it is not fitting that the divinity was formed. And next he relates what the angel said to Joseph: “Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary as your wife, for what has been conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.”²¹³ And one can find similar things [related] by the blessed Luke. For after he stated how the angel came to Mary and warned her that she was pregnant, saying, “Behold! You will conceive and you will bear a child,” etc.,²¹⁴ and Mary doubted these things, saying, “How will this come to be, since I have not known a man?”²¹⁵ [Luke] said the angel responded to her, saying, “The Holy Spirit will come and the power of the Most High will rest upon you. Thus, what is born from you will be holy; he will be called the child of the Most High.”²¹⁶ It is clear that not one of the things said here refers to the divinity.

[78] In addition to these things, let us now discuss the birth. What follows is similar: he was the one who acted according to the law, and he was diligent to keep it with full accuracy. We learn [this] sufficiently from the divine scriptures, when the evangelist says, “The child grew and became powerful in the Spirit, as he was being filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon him.”²¹⁷ In another [passage], “He went down with his parents, came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them.”²¹⁸

Latin and Greek

The Apostle also says something that agrees [with this], “And great indeed is the mystery of our piety: he²¹⁹ who was manifested in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit.”²²⁰ He says that

Syriac

And the Apostle said, “Great indeed is this mystery: he who was manifested in the flesh was also made righteous in the Spirit.”²²¹ Now he says “made righteous in the Spirit” in reference to him because

211 The translation follows the Syriac of BL fol. 17. There are two fragments that preserve the same material, one Greek and the other Latin (the opening sentence of the Latin fragment preserves a sentence that is absent in Greek; otherwise, they are identical). These parallels appear in the left-hand column at the appropriate place.

212 Matt 1:18. 213 Matt 1:20. 214 Luke 1:31. 215 Luke 1:34.

216 Luke 1:35. 217 Luke 2:40. 218 Luke 2:51.

219 The translation from Latin ends with “piety,” and the translation from Greek begins with “he.”

220 1 Tim 3:16. 221 1 Tim 3:16.

Latin and Greek

he “was made righteous in the Spirit” either because before his baptism he kept the law with the appropriate accuracy or because even after that he fulfilled the life of grace with great accuracy by the assistance of the Spirit.

Let us also proceed to the baptism. It is fitting to bring [this] to mind in snippets, so as not to extend our discussion ...

Syriac

either before his baptism he kept the law with all accuracy or after that he perfected the law through his graceful way of life of the Spirit and through his diligence.

Fragment 60

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

For not even what is said by John to him – “I need to be baptized by you and you come to me?”²²² – not even this will invalidate the fact that the one being baptized is the human being. For this would be appropriate for him even by reason of his humanity since in terms of virtue itself he was greatly superior to John, and on account of the nature of the divinity indwelling in him, he was rightly acknowledged as having a dignity not only surpassing John, but also surpassing all human beings and indeed even surpassing creation.

Fragment 61

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

Therefore, the Lord, wanting to demonstrate his endurance and philosophical character during his fast, did not ask for this to happen.²²³ And showing that he cares little for food and that nothing is more valuable to him than virtue, he says to [the devil], “A human being shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.”²²⁴

Fragment 62

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

For this is what the devil was eager to do: to persuade him that God cared nothing at all for him. And therefore he said, “If you are the Son of God,

222 Matt 3:14.

223 That is, that the stones become bread.

224 Matt 4:4.

do this”²²⁵ – that is, “Do something to show that God cares for you.” And he also made great promises so that by the former²²⁶ he might separate him from God and then by the promises make him his own. And in the first temptation he put bread before him, enticing him with pleasure to succumb to the temptation.

Fragment 63

From Book 13

(Translated from Greek)

Therefore, the Lord bestowed upon us the victory over [the devil] by defeating him in the three [temptations]. For when he refused to ask that bread come from God, he showed that he was immune to pleasure. And when he refused to hurl himself down, he despised renown, persuading everyone that this was of no concern to him. And when he remained immune to the world’s advantages in the course of the third [temptation], he showed that he kept himself undefeated by all of them on behalf of piety.

Fragment 64

From Book 13

(Translated from Latin)

It would be good, especially at this point, to draw a conclusion about the thrust that these statements have: that he lived among us, was baptized, was crucified, died, was buried, and rose again. We do not make these statements as if we were applying them to some mere human being. For each time we explain these statements we do not hesitate to add this (lest we give calumniators an occasion for speaking evilly): the indwelling by God the Word happens from the very construction²²⁷ in his mother’s womb, and indeed this indwelling does not happen in the way an indwelling ordinarily happens nor by way of that grace known to be in many, but in a certain exceptional way, according to which we also say that both natures are united and one person is effected by way of this union.

²²⁵ See Matt 4:3 and 4:6.

²²⁶ That is, by daring Jesus to do something.

²²⁷ The Latin word here is *plasmatio*, undoubtedly a translation of the Greek *diaplasis*; see note 79 above on “construction.”

Fragment 65

From Book 14

(Translated from Greek)

Accordingly, then, such great honor has come to be associated with the human being who was deemed worthy of divine indwelling, of sitting at the right hand of the Father, and of being worshiped by all creation. For God would never have assumed a human being and united him to himself so simply and without good reason, preparing him to be worshiped by all creation, nor would he have judged it right for intellectual natures to worship him, if what had come to be associated with him were not a common benefit for all creation.

Fragment 66

From Book 14

(Translated from Greek)

We shall rightly say the same in the case of the Lord too, that God the Word, because he knew his virtue – and this according to foreknowledge right from the beginning at the start of his construction²²⁸ – and because he was well pleased²²⁹ to indwell [in him] and united himself to him by the disposition of his will,²³⁰ bestowed upon him a certain greater grace, since the grace given to him would be given to all human beings after him. Accordingly, [God the Word] kept his²³¹ intention²³² for the good intact. For we should not say that the human being lacked any intention but that he preferred the good, or rather that he had in his intention an intense affection for the good and hatred for its opposite. And the inviolateness of his intention was preserved in him from the beginning by divine grace since God knew precisely what sort of individual he would be and in fact in order to support him provided him with great assistance by his own indwelling for the salvation of us all. Accordingly, one should not speak of injustice in regard to the human being assumed by the Lord having received something exceptional in comparison to all.

²²⁸ See note 79 above on “construction.”

²²⁹ The Greek participle *eudokēsas* is cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

²³⁰ The ancient Latin version of this fragment translates the Greek *tēi schesei tēs gnōmēs* as *affectu voluntatis*.

²³¹ That is, Jesus’s. ²³² In Greek, *prothesin*.

Fragment 67

From Book 14

(Translated from Latin)

He holds the place of an image²³³ in two senses. For people very often set up images of their loved ones after they die thinking that this provides enough consolation for their death, and they think they see the one who is neither seen nor present by beholding him, as it were, in the image, and in this way they quench the fire and the intensity of their longing. And furthermore people who have images of the emperors throughout their cities are seen to honor, by the cult and adoration of these images, those who are not present as if they were present and visible. Now both of these [functions of image] are fulfilled by him.²³⁴ For all who are with him, and pursue virtue, and have been prepared by repaying the debts owed to God, love him and honor him very much, and the divine nature, though it is not seen, fulfills love for him in the one who is seen by all, and thus everyone supposes that they are seeing him through him²³⁵ and are always present to him. And in this way they pay every honor [to him] as if to an imperial image since it is as if the divine nature is in him and is seen in him. For even though it is the Son who is said to indwell, nonetheless the Father is also with him and it is believed by every creature that he is with the Son inseparably in every way. And the Spirit too is not absent, seeing that he functions as the anointing for him and he is always with the one who has been assumed. And we ought not marvel at this, since the Father is also said to be with the Son in all people who pursue virtue: “For the Father and I will come and make our home with him.”²³⁶ It is clear to all that the Spirit is also inseparable from such people.

Fragment 68

From Book 15

(Translated from Latin)

On account of this each one is justly called “Son,” since there exists one person which the union of the natures produces.

²³³ See Col 1:15.

²³⁴ That is, Jesus.

²³⁵ That is, seeing the Son through Jesus.

²³⁶ John 14:23.

Fragment 69

From Book 15²³⁷

(*Translated from Latin and Greek*)

Let²³⁸ no one be deceived by the wiliness of their questions. For it is truly disgraceful to put aside “so great a cloud of witnesses,”²³⁹ as the Apostle said, and having been deceived by their crafty questions to join with the party of our opponents. So what is it that they ask with such cunning? Is Mary the Anthropotokos or the Theotokos? Who was it that was crucified, God or a human being? But in fact the answer to such questions is clear as well from our previous remarks in response to their questions; nonetheless, right now let us repeat the appropriate response briefly so that they may have no further occasion for craftiness. So²⁴⁰ when they ask, “Is Mary Anthropotokos or Theotokos?” let it be said by us, “Both” – the one by the nature of the reality, the other by relation. For she is Anthropotokos by her nature since the one in the womb of Mary, who also proceeded from it, was a human being. Yet she is Theotokos, since God was in the human being that was born, not that he was circumscribed in him by nature but that he was in him according to the disposition of his will.²⁴¹ And²⁴² so, there is justification for saying both, but not according to a similar rationale. For it is not the case that just as the human being received a beginning in order to exist in the womb, so too did God the Word, since he was before every creature. And so, there is justification for saying both and each of them according to its own rationale. Moreover, the same response ought to be given if they ask, “Was it God that was crucified or a human being?” It is both, but not according to a similar rationale. For the latter was crucified in that he underwent the suffering and was nailed to the tree and was arrested by the Jews, but the former because he was with him according to the reason previously stated.

237 The ancient Latin versions of this fragment identify its source as Book 12, but the Greek fragment notes that it is from Book 15. Here the Greek text is prioritized.

238 The translation begins with the Latin of C5T3. 239 Heb 12:1.

240 Here the translation switches to the Greek of LT28.

241 The ancient Latin version of this fragment translates the Greek *kata tēn schesin tēs gnōmēs* as *secundum adfectum voluntatis*.

242 Here the translation returns to the Latin of C5T3.

Fragment 70

From Book 15

(Translated from Latin and Greek)

For²⁴³ the Lord was troubled by and struggled with the passions of the soul more than with those of the body, and he subdued pleasures through his superior power of reasoning, unquestionably because the divinity acted as the mediator and assisted him in the achievement of this. Therefore,²⁴⁴ the Lord is seen engaged especially in the struggle with these. For having been neither deceived by craving for money nor tempted by desire for glory, he gave nothing to the flesh, since he could not be conquered by such things. Now if he had not received a soul and it was the divinity that conquered these things, the gain from those things he accomplished would in no way at all redound to us – for what similarity is there between the divinity and the human soul when it comes to perfection of conduct? – and the Lord's struggles would seem to have had a gain that does not redound to us but to have been for the sake of some charade. But if it is not possible to say this (since it is certain beyond a doubt that these things have been accomplished for our sake), and if he engaged in a greater struggle with the passions of the soul and a lesser one with those of the flesh, then however much it used to happen that those [passions of the soul] troubled him intensely and acutely, so much was there something that acutely stood in need of an intense remedy. In other words, in assuming both flesh and soul he used to struggle in both on behalf of both, not only mortifying sin in the flesh and calming his sensual desires and making them easily controllable by superior reason of the soul, but also instructing and training his soul both to conquer its own passions and to bridle the sensual desires of the flesh. For he did these things through the indwelling divinity; indwelling, this [divinity] acted as mediator for both of them.

Fragment 71

From an Unknown Book or Section²⁴⁵*(Translated from Syriac)*

Because of this they are outside the church of God. The fathers were right to cut them off like putrid members from a healthy body. But I would also

²⁴³ The translation begins with the Greek of LT29.

²⁴⁴ Here the translation switches to the Latin of C4T27.

²⁴⁵ This fragment has no internal indications of its original location, but it may belong to Book 15, which according to Gennadius cited “the traditions of the fathers”

like to offer a demonstration of these things: whether the fathers also spoke like this, or had the habit [of using] the name “human being.” We find this usage among many, so necessarily I wish to corroborate my argument with their testimonies and I [want to] look at the issue from all sides: from the importance of their deeds to the uprightness of their thoughts; from the proof of the scriptures to the common usage of those who have been brought to faith in Christ. [But] those who quarrel with us in their blasphemy will, contrary to all these things [I will raise], approve their [own] teachings, which they have established with something that is distinctly new and not mentioned in doctrine; and they also honor their weakness more than all their illness, while they tempt others everywhere to turn aside from the truth.

The first testimony that is appropriate for proving what I am saying comes from Hegesippus, who lived in the time of the apostles. For in his fifth book he included the words of James, the brother of our Lord Christ, and told the story of his death and how the Pharisees killed him.²⁴⁶ Then he related what his manner of life was, how he conducted himself, what garments he wore, what many thought of him on account of the excellence of his ways,²⁴⁷ and how he exhorted many Jews to have faith in Christ.²⁴⁸ And he said that on the day of the Passover many Jews gathered in the great city, along with the scribes and the Pharisees, and they said to him, “There are many who go astray in regard to the Messiah. But you, because all the people are persuaded by you on account of the excellence of your ways, go and get up on the pinnacle of the temple and turn every person away from

(see p. 421 above). Perhaps the testimonies from the apostle James, Hegesippus, and Eusebius of Caesarea discussed in this fragment were some of these “traditions.”

Alternatively, since Theodore attempts to demonstrate by appeal to patristic authorities the propriety of calling the incarnate Word as “human being,” this fragment could stem from one of the earlier sections of the book that deal with this topic (see Fragments 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, and 36).

246 Here Theodore begins to summarize the fragments of Hegesippus preserved in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.4–18.

247 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.4–7.

248 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.8–9 (GCS 9/1: 168, 2–8 Schwartz/Mommsen): “Certain individuals from the seven sects which are among the people ... tried to learn from him what the ‘gate’ of Jesus was [see John 10:1–9], and he said that he was the Savior. Some of them came to believe that Jesus was the Christ, but the aforementioned sects did not believe in either the resurrection or that he is coming to repay each according to their works [see Rom 2:6]. Now as many as came to believe did so through James.” The translation of Eusebius here and in the following notes is by Mark DelCogliano.

this opinion.”²⁴⁹ I will set down his own words; this is what he said, “The scribes and the Pharisees made James stand upon the pinnacle of the temple, and they called to him and said, ‘O just one, whom it is right for all of us to obey, since the people go astray after Jesus who was crucified, teach us what is the “gate” of Jesus?’ And he said to them with a loud voice, ‘Why are you asking me about Jesus, the Son of Man?’”²⁵⁰ With these words he showed there is another besides God the Word, which he called “Son of Man.” And he replied in reference to that one who was crucified, adding, “He sits in the heavens at the right hand of the great power, and he will come on clouds of heaven.”²⁵¹ For no one says that the divinity will arrive upon the clouds since it exists in every place. Rather, it is fitting that it is the human being that will come upon the clouds, even if it is not separate from the divinity. For this does not in any way detract from its union with the humanity. Eusebius of Caesarea quoted this account by Hegesippus in the book *Ecclesiastical History* that he wrote. Thus, as was said, there are three witnesses for this: the blessed and great James who is the brother of our Lord, Hegesippus who told his story in his book, and Eusebius who included the verbatim testimony of Hegesippus. If there were any doubt about this, namely, that it is fitting for the apostles to think like this, he would not have quoted it verbatim. He told his story because <...> it was appropriate that the one spoke it and the other told the story of the one [who spoke it].

It is acceptable, too, that in the history also Justin <...> was.²⁵² He said that it was from those who called our Lord a mere human being that Simon

- 249 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.10–11 (GCS 9/1: 168, 8–20 Schwartz/Mommsen): “Therefore, since many authorities were also believers [see John 12:42], there was an uproar among the Jews and scribes and Pharisees, who were saying, ‘The whole people is in danger of thinking that Jesus is the Christ.’ So when they gathered, they said to James, ‘We exhort you, restrain the people, for it has gone astray to Jesus, as if he were the Christ. We exhort you to persuade all who come for the day of the Passover in regard to Jesus. For all of us are persuaded by you since we testify about you, as does all the people, that you are righteous and that you show no partiality [see Luke 20:21]. Therefore, persuade the crowd that they not go astray in regard to Jesus. For indeed the whole people and all of us are persuaded by you. Stand, then, on the pinnacle of the temple, so that you may be manifested on high and your words may be easily heard by the whole people. For on account of the Passover all the tribes have gathered, along with the Gentiles.”
- 250 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.12–13 (GCS 9/1: 168, 20–25 Schwartz/Mommsen). The question is about the “gate” to the sheepfold in John 10:1–9.
- 251 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2.23.13 (GCS 9/1: 170, 1–2 Schwartz/Mommsen). Hegesippus echoes the language of Matt 26:64, which itself echoes Dan 7:13.
- 252 Justin mentions Simon and Menander in *First Apology* 26 and 56, but the information recounted here is not found in Justin. What follows seems to be based on Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.26, which quotes Justin, *First Apology* 26.

and Menander after him, the magicians, received their origin, but not because they called him a mere human being. After discussing Menander,²⁵³ [Eusebius] said that the “evil demon” attempted to “detach” Christians from “their devotion” to God; he chose to approach “the Ebionites whom the first Christians named in view of the poor and mean opinions” they confessed “about Christ.”²⁵⁴ “For they regarded him as a mere human being only declared righteous” in an ordinary way.²⁵⁵ Previously he called them “heretics”²⁵⁶ not simply, but to narrate those things about Simon and Menander, who nullified the corporeality of our Lord by saying that he appears as in illusions.²⁵⁷ Rightly he calls them “heretics” since they are fools when it comes to the Lord’s corporeality. They also deny his divinity. For they preach that he is a mere human being, because of which Eusebius finds fault with them when <...>

Fragment 72

From an Unknown Book or Section

(Translated from Syriac)

And again, in regard to the difference between the natures that we confess <...> since it is right in the case of the rest, even as many of them <...> human beings doubted them in their perversity. For it is clear from this which things are fittingly said about the humanity and which things differ from the divinity in their distinctions, while they coincide in the unique conjunction of all those things said about our Lord and Savior

253 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.26.

254 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.27.1 (GCS 9/1: 254, 24–256, 3 Schwartz/Mommsen): “But there were others whom the evil demon was unable to detach from their devotion to the Christ of God, yet he found them liable to being snared in another way and so won them over: these are the Ebionites whom the first [Christians] suitably named in view of their poor and mean opinions about Christ.”

255 See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.27.2 (GCS 9/1: 256, 3–4 Schwartz/Mommsen): “For they regarded him as ordinary and common, a human being declared righteous by progress in character, this alone, and born of the coupling of a man and Mary.”

256 In Syriac, *gvȳy acbrnyatha*, literally, “those who elect the alternate.” It is possible that this phrase is an odd rendering of the Greek *hairetikoi*, “sectarians” or “heretics.” The title given to chapter 27 at the beginning of Book 3 of the *Ecclesiastical History* is “On the heresy (*haireseōs*) of the Ebionites” (GCS 9/1: 184, 7 Schwartz/Mommsen). Perhaps that is what Theodore means when Eusebius “previously” referred to the Ebionites as “heretics.” All this, however, remains speculative.

257 It is unclear what passage of Eusebius Theodore is referring to here. Theodore appears to connect Eusebius’s words about Simon and Menander with a discussion of doceticism.

Jesus Christ. For when the natures are investigated separately in terms of what they indicate, there are some things that are fitting for the one nature and some for the other, as far as the rank of what is said about each of the natures is concerned. But when they are conjoined together in the union of the person, the two of them are spoken of in whatever way is fitting for this one [person] because of the union. For in this way too something that is separate in nature is manifested as spoken of jointly because of the union of the person <...>

<...> to whom and from whom was he born? And whose is he? In the narrative of the generations, it comes to David and from there it goes in the sequence of the succession until it finally arrives at Christ, when it says, “Matthan begot Jacob, Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, from whom Jesus was born, who is called Christ.”²⁵⁸ Now these words clearly demonstrate that it is about Christ in the flesh that he writes, and [the evangelist] even speaks of him as born from Mary. Since he was not writing about the divinity, it was necessary to show that the Messiah was born from Abraham’s seed. And lest Christ also be understood to have been born in the same sequence, he separates him from the three divisions containing fourteen [generations] each, saying, “Now the birth of the Messiah took place in this way: when Mary his mother had been betrothed to Joseph, even though they had not yet known each other, she found herself pregnant from the Holy Spirit.”²⁵⁹

Fragment 73

From an Unknown Book or Section

(Translated from Greek)

Made known by the foreknowledge of the Word, the human being born from the Virgin without seed was not separated from the Word, being conjoined to him by an identity of will,²⁶⁰ according to which, having been well pleased²⁶¹ [with him] he united him to himself and showed him to be indistinguishable from him in terms of activity²⁶² and to possess undividedly

²⁵⁸ Matt 1:15–16.

²⁵⁹ Matt 1:18.

²⁶⁰ In Greek, *tautotēti gnōmēs*.

²⁶¹ In Greek, *eudokēsas*, a participle cognate with *eudokia*, “good pleasure.”

²⁶² Here I follow the emendation of *kai tēn energeian* to *kata tēn energeian* suggested by Richard Price, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014), 355.

the same sovereignty and authority and also a worship that, by the law of equality, cannot be distinguished.

APPENDIX

ST = Fragments preserved by Severus of Antioch in various works

LT = Fragments preserved by Leontius of Byzantium, *Unmasking and Triumph over the Nestorians*

FT = Fragments preserved by Facundus of Hermiane, *In Defense of the Three Chapters*

C4 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Fourth Session

C5 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Fifth Session

C6 = Fragments preserved by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople* in 553, Sixth Session

BT = Fragments preserved in *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius*

BL = British Library Cod. Add. 14669

Jansen = Jansen's numbering

|| = parallel fragment (whether partial or full)

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
1.	I	–	BT (Syriac)	–
2.	I	–	C4T25 (Latin)	I
	–	11	BT1 (Syriac)	–
3.	–	33	BT2 (Syriac)	–
4.	–	35	BT3 (Syriac)	–
5.	–	36	BT4 (Syriac)	–
6.	–	36	BT5 (Syriac)	–
7.	–	37	BT6 (Syriac)	–
8.	–	38	BT7 (Syriac)	–
9.	–	42–43	BL fol. 4 (Syriac)	–
10.	–	49–50	BL fol. 7 (Syriac)	–
11.	–	50	BT8 (Syriac)	–
12.	–	51	BT9 (Syriac)	–

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
13.	–	51	BT ₁₀ (Syriac)	–
14.	5	52	FT ₁₇ (Latin)	III
15.	6	54	FT ₁₈ (Latin)	IV
16.	–	–	BL fol. 15 (Syriac)	–
17.	6	54	FT ₁₉ (Latin)	V
18.	–	56	BT ₁₁ (Syriac)	–
19.	–	–	BL fol. 5 (Syriac)	–
20.	6	–	BL fol. 6 (Syriac)	–
21.	7	–	LT ₁ (Greek)	VI
	7	–	C ₄ T ₃₀ (Latin)	–
22.	7	–	LT ₂ (Greek)	VII
	–	59	BT ₁₂ (Syriac)	–
	–	–	ST ₄ (Syriac)	–
	–	59	BT ₁₃ (Syriac)	–
23.	7	59	LT ₃ (Greek)	VIII
	–	59	BT ₁₄ (Syriac)	–
24.	7	–	LT ₄ (Greek)	IX
	–	–	ST ₁ (Syriac)	–
	–	60	BT ₁₅ (Syriac)	–
25.	–	60	BT ₁₆ (Syriac)	–
26.	7	–	C ₄ T ₃₁ (Latin)	X
27.	8	–	LT ₅ (Greek)	XI
28.	–	–	BL fol. 2 (Syriac)	–
29.	–	–	BL fol. 1 (Syriac)	–
30.	–	62–63	BL fol. 10 (Syriac)	–
	8	–	LT ₆ (Greek)	XII
	8	–	C ₄ T ₂₉ (Latin)	–
	–	63	BT ₁₇ (Syriac)	–
	8	–	LT ₇ (Greek)	XIII
31.	–	–	BL fol. 3 (Syriac)	–
32.	9	–	LT ₈ (Greek)	XIV
33.	9	–	FT ₂₅ (Latin)	XV+XVI
34.	9	–	LT ₉ (Greek)	XVII
35.	–	66	BT ₁₈ (Syriac)	–
36.	–	66	BT ₁₉ (Syriac)	–
37.	10	70	FT ₂₀ (Latin)	XVIII

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
38.	10	–	LT ₁₀ (Greek)	XIX
39.	10	–	LT ₁₁ (Greek)	XX
40.	–	–	BL fol. 8 (Syriac)	–
41.	–	–	C ₅ T ₁ (Latin)	XXI
	10	–	LT ₁₂ (Greek)	XXI
42.	10–11	–	BL fol. 11 (Syriac)	–
43.	11	–	BL fol. 12–13 (Syriac)	–
	–	73	BT ₂₀ (Syriac)	–
	–	73	BT ₂₁ (Syriac)	–
	11	–	C ₆ T ₁ (Latin)	XXII
44.	–	–	BL fol. 9 (Syriac)	–
45.	–	73	BT ₂₂ (Syriac)	–
46.	–	77	BT ₂₃ (Syriac)	–
47.	12	–	LT ₁₃ (Greek)	XXIII
48.	12	–	LT ₁₄ (Greek)	XXIV
	–	–	C ₅ T ₂ (Latin)	–
	–	–	C ₄ T ₄₈ (Latin)	–
49.	12	–	LT ₁₅ (Greek)	XXV
50.	12	–	LT ₁₆ (Greek)	XXVI
	12	–	C ₄ T ₄₉ (Latin)	–
51.	12	–	LT ₁₇ (Greek)	XXVII
	–	–	C ₅ T ₅ (Latin)	XXVII
52.	12	–	C ₆ T ₃ (Latin)	XXVIII
53.	12	–	LT ₁₈ (Greek)	XXIX
	12	–	C ₄ T ₅₀ (Latin)	–
54.	12	–	LT ₁₉ (Greek)	XXX
55.	12	–	LT ₂₀ (Greek)	XXXI
56.	12	–	FT ₂₁ (Latin)	XXXII
57.	–	77	BT ₂₄ (Syriac)	–
58.	–	77	BT ₂₅ (Syriac)	–
59.	–	77–78	BL fol. 17 (Syriac)	–
	13	–	C ₄ T ₅₅ (Latin)	XXXIII
	13	–	LT ₂₁ (Greek)	XXXIII
60.	13	–	LT ₂₂ (Greek)	XXXIV
61.	13	–	LT ₂₃ (Greek)	XXXV
62.	13	–	LT ₂₄ (Greek)	XXXVI

CEECW	Book	Section	Behr	Jansen
63.	13	–	LT ₂₅ (Greek)	XXXVII
64.	13	–	FT ₃ (Latin)	XXXVIII
65.	14	–	LT ₂₆ (Greek)	XXXIX
66.	14	–	LT ₂₇ (Greek)	XL
67.	14	–	C ₄ T ₁₇ (Latin)	XLI
68.	15	–	FT ₂₂ (Latin)	XLII
69.	12	–	C ₅ T ₃ (Latin)	XLIII
	15	–	LT ₂₈ (Greek)	XLIII
	–	–	ST ₂ (Syriac)	–
	12	–	C ₄ T ₄₅ (Latin)	–
70.	15	–	C ₄ T ₂₇ (Latin)	XLIV
	15	–	LT ₂₉ (Greek)	XLIV
71.	–	–	BL fol. 14 (Syriac)	–
72.	–	–	BL fol. 16 (Syriac)	–
73.	–	–	–	XLV (Greek)